

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 88-589

EXPANSION OF CROP INSURANCE COVERAGE.

Amends the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to increase from 100 to 150 the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

S. 277

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 16 (legislative day, JANUARY 15), 1963

MR. FULBRIGHT introduced the following bill ; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the fourth sentence of section 508 (a) of the Federal
4 Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1508 (a)), is
5 amended by striking out "in not to exceed 100 counties",
6 and inserting in lieu thereof "in not to exceed 150 counties".

A BILL

To amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT

JANUARY 16 (legislative day, JANUARY 15), 1963

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

Aug. 21, 1963

agencies have put into effect employment and promotion practices that are discriminatory due to race, creed, national origin, or sex." p. D657

SENATE

7. THE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE voted to report (but did not actually report) the following: p. D655

~~Nomination of George L. Mehren to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture~~
~~S. 1915, the Proxmire dairy bill to encourage the reduction of excess marketing of milk.~~

S. 277, to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

8. WATERSHEDS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved seven watershed projects. p. D655

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

9. GRAZING LANDS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Harvery inserting an editorial opposing converting cropland into grazing lands. p. A5341
10. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Reps. Joelson and McLoskey debating the merits of continuing the foreign aid program. pp. A5341-2, A5348-9
11. FARM LABOR. Extension of remarks of Rep. Rosenthal inserting an editorial voicing opposition to extending the Mexican farm labor program. p. A5359
12. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Purcell inserting a speech by Rep. Poage opposing the expansion of private power companies into rural electric cooperatives areas. pp. A5360-2
13. FOREIGN TRADE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Curtis urging the elimination of "the economic distortions which are caused by efforts to manage and protect segments of our domestic economy" if our goal is for expansion of international trade, and specifically mentioning the U. S. poultry difficulties with the Common Market. pp. A5363-4
14. BUDGET. Extension of remarks of Rep. Curtis inserting an article opposing the increased paper work allegedly required by the Government from businesses, and mentioning USDA as "the agency with the largest number of regularly required reports". ppp. A5367-9

BILLS INTRODUCED

15. FARM LABOR. H. R. 8195, by Rep. Purcell, and H. R. 8197, by Rep. Teague, Calif., to amend section 510 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to Agriculture Committee.
16. PROPERTY. H. R. 8185, by Rep. Fogarty, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations; to Government Operations Committee.
17. HOLIDAY. H. R. 8189, by Rep. Libonati, declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to Judiciary Committee.

18. PATENTS. H. R. 8190, by Rep. Willis, to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office; to Judiciary Committee.
19. VETERANS BENEFITS. H. R. 8196, by Rep. Ryan, N.Y., to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to Veterans' Affairs Committee. Remarks of author, pp. 14709-10
20. CIVIL DEFENSE. H. R. 8200, by Rep. Hebert, to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide for shelter in Federal structures, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space; to Armed Services Committee.

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

21. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK. H. R. 3872, to extend the Export-Import Bank to June 30, 1968, and increase its lending authority by \$2 billion. Approved August 20, 1963 (Public Law 88-101).
22. FORESTRY. S. 1388, to extend the boundaries of the Cache National Forest in Utah by including 1,700 additional acres. Approved August 19, 1963 (Public Law 88-99).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS AUG. 22:

Registration of pesticides, H. Agriculture (Members of Congress and outside witnesses).

USDA appropriation bill, S. Appropriations (exec).

Establishment of land and water conservation fund, H. Interior.

Legislative jurisdiction over certain lands, S. Gov't Operations.

Radiation protection guides and counter measures, Jt. Atomic Energy.

Federal pay legislation, H. Civil Service

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued August 26, 1963
For actions of August 23, 1963
88th-1st; No. 132

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....18,25
Agricultural
 appropriations.....5
Appropriations.....5,34
Area redevelopment.....27
Assistant Secretary.....1
Beef imports.....12
Civil defense.....40
Committee assignments...10
Crop insurance.....3

Dairy industry.....2
Education.....14,35
Expenditures.....13
Farm labor.....23,28
Fertilizers.....21
Foreign aid.....11,19
Foreign trade.....21
Forestry.....8,31
General services.....9
Lands.....29

Legislative program..17,24
Lettuce.....22
Loans.....8,31
Lumber tariff.....33
Manpower.....4,39
Market news.....20
Minerals.....29
National flower.....30
Nomination.....1
Personnel.....37
Procurement.....9
Public Law 480.....7
Reclamation.....15
Science.....16
Small business.....36
Textiles.....21
Transportation.....6,32
Travel expenses.....37
Water resources.....26
Wildlife.....38

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committees reported: Mehren nomination. Dairy bill. Bill to increase number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered. Manpower Development and Training Act amendments. Sen. Miller inserted items favoring restrictions on beef and veal imports. House passed foreign aid authorization bill. Rep. Findley requested public hearing on new USDA market news service.

SENATE

1. **NOMINATIONS.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported the nomination of George L. Mehren to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. p. 14859
2. **DAIRY INDUSTRY.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1915, the Proxmire dairy bill to encourage the reduction of excess marketing of milk (S. Rept. 449). Sen. Proxmire expressed confidence that the bill will reduce the cost of the farm program, and will increase dairy farm income. p. 14860
3. **CROP INSURANCE.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 277, to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year from not to exceed 100 to not to exceed 150 (S. Rept. 450). p. 14860

4. MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendments S. 1716, to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (S. Rept. 458). pp. 14860-1
5. APPROPRIATIONS. The "Daily Digest" states that the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee "continued to consider H. R. 6754, fiscal 1964 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and related agencies, but did not conclude action thereon, and recessed subject to call." p. D664
6. TRANSPORTATION. The Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. J. Res. 102, to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain railroads and their employees (S. Rept. 459). p. 14861
7. PUBLIC LAW 480. Received from the President the 18th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83rd Congress, for the six-month period ending June 30, 1963 (H. Doc. 149). p. 14858
8. FORESTRY; LOANS. Received from Treasury a proposed bill "to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts"; to Banking and Currency Committee. p. 14860
9. GENERAL SERVICES; PROCUREMENT. Received from GAO a report "on unnecessary depot handling and transportation costs of supply items, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration." p. 14860
10. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Agreed to a resolution relieving Sen. Proxmire from service on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee and assigning him to serve on the Appropriations Committee. p. 14865
Agreed to a resolution relieving Sen. Metcalf from service on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and assigning him to serve on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. p. 14865
11. FOREIGN AID. Sens. Dirksen and Gruening submitted amendments intended to be proposed to the foreign aid authorization bill. pp. 14865-6
12. BEEF IMPORTS. Sen. Miller expressed concern over increased imports of beef and veal and inserted several items urging restrictions on such imports, including a letter to Secretary Freeman from the National Livestock Feeders Association criticizing a USDA release on the effects of beef imports on the domestic livestock industry. pp. 14869-74
13. FEDERAL EXPENDITURES. Sen. Miller urged a reduction in Federal expenditures and inserted two articles on the subject. pp. 14867-9
14. EDUCATION. Sen. Mundt urged enactment of legislation to continue Federal Assistance to schools in Federally impacted areas. p. 14875
15. RECLAMATION. Sen. Metcalf praised the Federal reclamation program and defended the program against criticism in a Life magazine article. pp. 14884-6
16. SCIENCE. Sens. Bartlett and Keating urged enactment of legislation to provide for the establishment of a Congressional Office of Science and Technology. pp. 14891-4
17. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Metcalf stated that it is planned to take up the bill for settlement of the railroad dispute on Mon. p. 14859

EXPANSION OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE COVERAGE

AUGUST 23, 1963.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 277]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 277) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill is identical to S. 2859 which was considered and passed by the Senate on June 23, 1962. The bill was also considered and reported favorably by the House Committee on Agriculture on September 19, 1962. However, this was too late in the session for it to receive consideration by the House of Representatives.

This bill would permit Federal crop insurance to be offered in 150 additional counties each year. At present expansion is limited to 100 new counties each year.

Crop insurance is offered farmers in selected counties by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. This Corporation is wholly Government-owned and provides all-risk crop insurance protection against unavoidable causes of loss.

In 1948 the crop insurance program was placed on a limited, experimental basis to gain experience and accumulate actuarial data. This was done by Congress because of the adverse experience the crop insurance program had from 1938 to 1947 when it was on a national basis. During this experimental period (1948-61) expansion to new counties has been limited. In no year during this period did the number of new counties allocated approach the 100-county limitation. The objective was the development of a sound program that could be operated on a national basis.

Although expansion in the last 14 years has been limited, the Department feels that the experience gained during this period is sufficient

to justify a more rapid rate of expansion so as to provide more farmers with the protection provided under the all-risk crop insurance program.

Table I summarizes the crop insurance operation for the crop year 1963.

TABLE 1.—1963 crop year (estimated)

Number of counties.....	1, 096
Number of county programs.....	2, 379
Number of commodities insured.....	20
Number of crops insured.....	421, 000
Premiums.....	\$28, 500, 000
Indemnities.....	\$25, 600, 000
Loss adjustment cost.....	\$1, 050, 000

In 1948, when the program was placed on a limited basis, the law provided that not more than seven commodities might be covered the first year and not more than three additional commodities each year thereafter. Table II shows the commodities now covered and the number of county programs in effect in 1963.

TABLE 11.—Commodities insured and number of county programs in effect in 1963

Commodity	County programs	Commodity	County programs
Apples.....	3	Peanuts.....	33
Barley.....	164	Peas.....	13
Beans.....	26	Potatoes.....	9
Cherries.....	1	Raisins.....	7
Citrus.....	12	Rice.....	9
Combined crop.....	26	Soybeans.....	371
Corn.....	380	Tobacco.....	212
Cotton.....	198	Tomatoes.....	3
Flax.....	85	Wheat.....	573
Grain sorghum.....	67		
Oats.....	168	Total.....	2, 379
Peaches.....	19		

Crop insurance is a program under which farmers pay a premium for the protection they get against crop losses. Premiums in effect for the various crops are designed to cover losses and provide for a reasonable reserve, but not administrative costs, although some administrative costs are paid out of premium income.

The total cost of the program, including administrative expenses, since its inception in 1938, amounts to \$202,061,804. Of this, \$68,506,130 are the losses experienced because indemnities and other costs charged against premiums exceeded premiums.

However, for the period 1948-62 premiums exceed indemnities and other costs paid out of premiums by \$4,493,870. During this period \$5,711,958 in loss adjustment costs and \$3,574,569 in administrative costs were paid out of premiums.

Administrative costs (appropriated) for the entire period 1938-62 amounts to \$133,555,674. Of this, \$87,728,600 is chargeable to the 1948-63 period.

Table III shows complete data on the program from its inception.

TABLE III.—*Income and expenses, 1939-62*

Crop year	Number contracts in force	Program operations							Net surplus or deficit program	Administrative cost (appropriated)	Surplus or deficit (—), including administrative cost
		Premiums (income)	Indemnities (cost)	Provision for uncollectible accounts (cost)	Income from commodity transactions	Loss adjustment cost	Administrative cost charged to program	Other net income (not distributed)			
1938.....	165,775	\$3,410,940	\$5,601,562	—	—\$1,418	—	—	—	—\$2,192,040	\$234,546	—\$234,546
1939.....	360,596	9,155,000	13,694,264	—	—175,210	—	—	—	—4,714,474	4,351,672	—6,543,712
1940.....	371,390	7,096,349	18,924,481	—	4,182,665	—	—	—	—7,045,477	5,650,839	—10,365,313
1941.....	462,019	14,747,185	24,036,874	—	1,946,845	—	—	—	—8,336,594	5,028,729	—12,674,206
1942.....	422,420	17,459,455	33,231,256	—	776,582	—	—	—	—15,276,519	6,775,802	—15,112,396
1943.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6,447,732	—21,724,251
Total, 1938-43.....	1,782,200	51,808,929	96,888,437	375,000	6,729,404	—	—	\$28,628	—38,136,476	28,489,320	—66,625,796
1944.....	(¹)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,708,605	—1,708,605
1945.....	151,341	9,273,559	23,245,858	136,038	87,000	—	—	—	—14,022,237	2,502,248	—16,524,485
1946.....	361,569	33,091,352	63,488,727	403,062	2,227,370	—	—	—	—28,653,067	6,210,890	—34,864,057
1947.....	397,931	40,618,690	36,243,844	1,353,801	3,128,432	—	—	—	7,179,477	6,915,911	263,566
Total, 1944-47.....	910,841	83,013,601	121,978,429	1,983,801	5,452,802	—	—	632,303	—34,863,524	17,337,754	—52,201,278
Total, 1938-47.....	2,693,041	134,882,530	218,866,866	2,358,801	12,182,206	—	—	660,931	—73,000,000	45,827,074	—118,827,074
1948.....	169,125	12,683,974	6,754,015	63,500	—25,937	—	—	—	5,840,522	4,284,468	1,556,054
1949.....	165,076	11,501,239	15,530,963	57,600	231,981	—	—	—	—3,855,373	4,010,701	—7,866,074
1950.....	306,685	14,103,899	12,798,839	71,600	—	—	—	—	1,233,460	4,780,354	—3,546,894
1951.....	343,210	19,110,633	21,358,643	194,000	—	—	—	—	—2,422,010	5,588,014	—8,005,024
1952.....	340,686	21,200,815	20,609,019	212,000	—	—	—	—	—379,796	5,952,023	—5,572,227
1953.....	406,630	27,097,885	31,056,228	271,000	—	—	—	—	—4,223,543	6,706,607	—10,936,150
1954.....	346,887	22,654,797	28,030,713	227,000	—	—	—	—	—5,602,916	5,940,033	—11,542,949
1955.....	319,958	22,329,676	25,504,643	223,000	—	—	—	—	—3,932,199	5,810,356	—9,742,555
1956.....	324,949	22,139,250	27,890,137	221,000	—	—	—	—	—7,023,365	6,210,016	—13,233,381
1957.....	307,604	17,407,504	12,003,808	174,000	—	—	\$138,254	—	4,478,273	6,210,000	—1,731,727
1958.....	324,435	17,616,315	4,504,805	176,000	—	—	—	—	12,277,590	6,376,700	5,900,890
1959.....	339,448	18,461,773	14,137,841	185,000	—	—	—	—	3,027,985	6,376,700	—3,348,715
1960.....	330,448	17,796,881	10,316,173	143,000	—	—	—	—	6,233,440	6,376,700	—143,260
1961.....	320,292	18,149,059	16,093,470	145,000	—	—	—	—	642,457	6,561,000	—5,918,543
1962.....	363,760	21,867,345	23,966,775	175,000	—	—	—	—	—5,082,507	6,549,928	—11,632,435
Total 1948-62.....	4,709,208	284,120,895	270,536,102	1,464,408	206,044	5,711,958	3,574,569	1,453,968	4,493,870	87,728,600	—83,234,730
Grand total, 1938-62.....	7,402,249	419,003,425	488,902,998	3,823,209	12,388,250	5,711,958	3,574,569	2,114,899	—68,506,130	133,555,674	—202,061,804

¹ No insurance.² Includes miscellaneous income items for interest earned on premiums, nonrefundable credits, and miscellaneous prior year adjustments of premiums, indemnities, and provision for uncollectible accounts.

The Department of Agriculture favors enactment of this bill. The report on the bill from the Department follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1963.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of January 18, 1963, for a report on S. 277, a bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

The Department has no objection to the passage of this bill.

The bill provides for an increase in the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year from 100 to 150.

In 1948 the crop insurance program was placed on a limited, experimental basis to gain experience and accumulate actuarial data. This was done by Congress because of the adverse experience the crop insurance program had from 1938 to 1947 when it was on a national basis. During the period 1948-61, expansion to new counties has been limited. In no year during this period did the number of new counties allocated approach the 100-county limitation.

After 14 years of experience on a limited basis, expansion is progressing at a more rapid rate. For the 1962 crop year, 100 new counties were added to the program, and 100 additional counties have been allocated for the 1963 crop year. Current plans for 1964 also provide for expansion of the crop insurance program to 100 additional counties. If the limitation on new counties is increased from 100 to 150, it will permit expansion at a more rapid rate. The number of new counties that could be added to the program each year, would of course depend on the annual availability of funds for expansion of the crop insurance program.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, *Secretary.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

* * * * *

SEC. 508. To carry out the purposes of this title the Corporation is authorized and empowered—

(a) Commencing with crops planted for harvest in 1948, for the purpose of determining the most practical plan, terms, and conditions of insurance for agricultural commodities, if sufficient actuarial data are available, as determined by the Board, to insure, or to reinsure

insurers of, producers of such agricultural commodities under any plan or plans of insurance determined by the Board to be adapted to any such commodity. Such insurance shall be against loss of the insured commodity due to unavoidable causes, including drought, flood, hail, wind, frost, winterkill, lightning, fire, excessive rain, snow, wildlife, hurricane, tornado, insect infestation, plant disease, and such other unavoidable causes as may be determined by the Board: *Provided*, That, except in the case of tobacco, such insurance shall not extend beyond the period the insured commodity is in the field. In 1948 insurance shall be limited to not more than seven agricultural commodities (including wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco) and to not more than three additional agricultural commodities in each year thereafter: *Provided*, That other agricultural commodities may be included in multiple crop insurance (insurance on two or more agricultural commodities under one contract with a producer). Beginning with crops planted for harvest in 1954, crop insurance may be offered each year in not to exceed ~~100~~ 150 counties in addition to the number of counties in which such insurance was offered in the preceding year. In determining the new counties in which such insurance is to be offered and the commodities to be insured, the Corporation shall take into consideration the demand of farmers for such insurance, the extent to which such insurance is available to commercial producers of insured commodities, and the anticipated risk of loss to the Corporation. Reinsurance for private insurance companies shall be limited to not to exceed twenty counties which may be selected without regard to the other county limitations specified herein. Any insurance offered against loss in yield shall not cover in excess of 75 per centum of the recorded or appraised average yield of the commodity on the insured farm for a representative period subject to such adjustments as the Board may prescribe to the end that the average yields fixed for farms in the same area, which are subject to the same conditions, may be fair and just: *Provided*, That if 75 per centum of the average yield represents generally more protection than the investment in the crop in any area, taking into consideration recognized farming practices, the Board shall reduce such maximum percentage so as more nearly to reflect the investment in the crop in such area. Insurance provided under this subsection shall not cover losses due to the neglect or malfeasance of the producer, or to the failure of the producer to reseed to the same crop in areas and under circumstances where it is customary to so reseed, or to the failure of the producer to follow established good farming practices. Counties selected by the Board shall be representative of the several areas where the agricultural commodity insured is normally produced. The Board may limit or refuse insurance in any county or area, or on any farm, on the basis of the insurance risk involved. Insurance shall not be provided on any agricultural commodity in any county in which the Board determines that the income from such commodity constitutes an unimportant part of the total agricultural income of the county, except that insurance may be provided for producers on farms situated in a local producing area bordering on a county with a crop-insurance program. The Corporation shall report annually to the Congress the results of its operations as to each commodity insured.

(b) To fix adequate premiums for insurance in the agricultural commodity or in cash, at such rates as the Board deems sufficient

to cover claims for crop losses on such insurance and to establish as expeditiously as possible a reasonable reserve against unforeseen losses: *Provided*, That such premiums may be established on the basis of the parity or comparable price for the commodity as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture, or on the basis of an average market price designated by the Board. Such premiums shall be collected at such time or times, or shall be secured in such manner, as the Board may determine.

(c) To adjust and pay claims for losses in the agricultural commodity or in cash, under rules prescribed by the Board: *Provided*, That indemnities may be determined on the same price basis as premiums are determined for the crop with respect to which such indemnities are paid. The Corporation shall provide for the posting annually in each county at the county courthouse of a list of indemnities paid for losses on farms in such county. In the event that any claim for indemnity under the provisions of this title is denied by the Corporation, an action on such claim may be brought against the Corporation in the United States district court, or in any court of record of the State having general jurisdiction, sitting in the district or county in which the insured farm is located, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such district courts to determine such controversies without regard to the amount in controversy: *Provided*, That no suit on such claim shall be allowed under this section unless the same shall have been brought within one year after the date when notice of denial of the claim is mailed to and received by the claimant.

(d) From time to time, in such manner and through such agencies as the Board may determine, to purchase, handle, store, insure, provide storage facilities for, and sell the agricultural commodity, and pay any expenses incidental thereto, it being the intent of this provision, however, that, insofar as practicable, the Corporation shall purchase the agricultural commodity only at the rate and to a total amount equal to the payment of premiums in cash by farmers or to replace promptly the agricultural commodity sold to prevent deterioration; and shall sell the agricultural commodity only to the extent necessary to cover payments of indemnities and to prevent deterioration; *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall prevent prompt offset purchases and sales of the agricultural commodity for convenience in handling. Nothing in this section shall prevent the Corporation from accepting, for the payment of premiums, notes payable in the commodity insured, or the cash equivalent, upon such security as may be determined pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and from purchasing the quantity of the commodity represented by any of such notes not paid at maturity. The restriction on the purchase and sale of the agricultural commodity provided in this section shall be made a part of any crop insurance agreement made under this title. Notwithstanding any provision of this title, there shall be no limitation upon the legal or equitable remedies available to the insured to enforce against the Corporation the foregoing restriction with respect to purchases and sales of the agricultural commodity.

(e) In connection with insurance upon yields of cotton, to include provision for additional premiums and indemnity in terms of lint cotton to cover loss of cottonseed, such additional premium and indemnity to be determined on the basis of the average relationship

between returns from cottonseed and returns from lint cotton for the same period of years as that used for computing yields and premium rates.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Corporation is hereby authorized, under such terms and conditions as it deems consistent with sound reinsurance principles, to provide reinsurance on any crop or plantation insurance provided in Puerto Rico by a duly authorized agency of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico: *Provided, That*, no application for reinsurance authorized herein shall be approved, unless the Corporation shall have determined that the reinsurance deemed necessary is not available from recognized private sources at reasonable cost.



Calendar No. 426

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 277

[Report No. 450]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 16 (legislative day, JANUARY 15), 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

AUGUST 23, 1963

Reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, without amendment

A BILL

To amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the fourth sentence of section 508 (a) of the Federal
4 Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1508 (a)), is
5 amended by striking out “in not to exceed 100 counties”,
6 and inserting in lieu thereof “in not to exceed 150 counties”.

A BILL

To amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT

JANUARY 16 (legislative day, JANUARY 15), 1963

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

AUGUST 23, 1963

Reported without amendment

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued August 29, 1963
For actions of August 28, 1963
88th-1st, No. 135

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....11,19	Electrification.....23	Lands.....2
Appropriations.....30	Exports.....15	Legislative program..10,18
Area redevelopment.....26	Farm labor.....22	Manpower.....4,10
Civil defense.....16	Foreign aid.....5,21	Marketing News.....24
Crop insurance.....1	Foreign trade.....8,13,15	National parks.....2
Dairy.....10	Highways.....14	Opinion poll.....20
Domestic Peace Corps....20	Information.....24	Personnel.....6,29
Education.....20	Item veto.....30	Political activity.....29
		Prices.....9
		Public debt.....32
		Public works.....7
		Reclamation.....3
		Recreation.....28
		Research.....12
		Retirement.....6
		Stockpiling.....17
		Surplus commodities....31
		Transportation... 26A,27
		Youth employment.....20,25

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bill to increase number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered. Sen. Miller criticized Common Market tariff increases on U. S. agricultural products. Sen. Humphrey defended President's record on support of foreign aid program. House Rules Committee reported measure for investigation of Federal research programs.

SENATE

1. CROP INSURANCE.. Passed without amendment S. 277, to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year from not to exceed 100 to not to exceed 150. pp. 15244-5

2. LANDS. Passed as reported H. R. 6118, to amend the act providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for development and expansion of communities so as to permit selection of tracts of not less than 160 acres (rather than blocks of not less than 5,760 acres). p. 15251

Passed without amendment S. 1175, to authorize a revision of the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park, N. Mex. pp. 15251-2

Agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 61, expressing the sense of Congress in respect to marking the Lewis and Clark Trail from St. Louis, Mo., to the Pacific Northwest by this Department, Interior, and Army. pp. 15250-1

3. RECLAMATION. Passed as reported S. 46, to provide that the cost of investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be nonreimbursable. pp. 15248-9
4. MANPOWER TRAINING. S. 1716, to postpone the effective date of the State matching requirements under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 from June 30, 1964, to June 30, 1965, and to increase the authorization for training programs under the act from the present \$161 million to \$322 million, was made the unfinished business of the Senate. p. 15259
5. FOREIGN AID Sen. Humphrey defended the President's record of support for foreign aid while a member of Congress against recent criticism by Sen. Goldwater and reviewed the President's record on this matter. pp. 15260-2
Sen. Proxmire urged that foreign aid to Yugoslavia be discontinued and inserted an article to support his position, "Behind the Communist Colloquy." pp. 15235-6
6. PERSONNEL; RETIREMENT. Received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill "to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to certain annuity increase legislation"; to Post Office and Civil Service Commission. p. 15232
7. PUBLIC WORKS. Sen. Gruening expressed concern over the number of unemployed and urged enactment of legislation to increase the appropriations for the accelerated public works programs as a means of providing more jobs for the unemployed. pp. 15236-7
8. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Miller criticized tariff increases by the European Common Market on imports of U. S. poultry and other farm commodities and expressed concern that further tariff increases may seriously affect our domestic farm economy. pp. 15263-4
9. PRICES. Sen. Miller expressed concern over the effects of the recent increase in the consumer price index on the purchasing power of the dollar. p. 15263
10. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield stated that the Manpower Development and Training Act amendments bill will be considered next Tues., and this will probably be followed by consideration of the dairy bill. pp. 15245, 15254
11. ADJOURNED until Fri., Aug. 30. p. 15270

HOUSE

12. RESEARCH. The Rules Committee reported H. Res. 504, to create a select House committee to investigate research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government (H. Rept. 718). pp. 15297-8
Rep. Daddario inserted a statement of the role and objectives of the Science and Astronautics Committee's Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. pp. 15312-3
13. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Lipscomb inserted his letter to the President urging withdrawal of the licenses for shipping potash mining machinery to U.S.S.R. pp. 15308-9
14. HIGHWAYS. Rep. Montoya urged the Commerce Department "to permit a greater degree of access to and exit from any part of the Interstate Highway System" through an area having a population of 25,000 or less. pp. 15311-2
15. EXPORTS. Received a letter from Commerce transmitting a quarterly report on export control. p. 15324

Therefore, in principle, American Veterans' Committee endorses any peacetime bill of rights which will carry out the principles hereinabove set forth and which will allow for equitable readjustment benefits to peacetime veterans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MAINTENANCE, OPERATION, AND REPAIR OF BRIDGE ACROSS MOUNT HOPE BAY, R.I.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1936) authorizing the State of Rhode Island, or its instrumentality, to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will not come before the Senate until 2 o'clock, unless the Senator wishes to ask unanimous consent that it be laid before the Senate at this time.

Mr. PASTORE. If there is no objection, I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1936) authorizing the State of Rhode Island, or its instrumentality, to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the general statement which appears in the report No. 451, Calendar No. 427, beginning on page 1, and continuing through to the committee views on page 3, be printed at this point in the RECORD as an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1936) authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay, subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 1936 is to authorize the State of Rhode Island or the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, after it has obtained title to the Mount Hope Bridge,

constructed under the authority of the act approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1391), to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge in accordance with the laws of the State of Rhode Island applicable to such bridge, subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 84), pertaining to the construction of bridges over navigable waters.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The act approved March 3, 1927, authorized the construction of a toll bridge across Mount Hope Bay between Bristol and Portsmouth, R.I. The bridge was completed in October 1929 at a cost of about \$3.9 million, and has been in operation as a toll facility since that time.

The island of Aquidneck in Narragansett Bay, which consists of the communities of Portsmouth, Newport, and Middletown, has two bridge connections with the mainland, the Mount Hope Bridge at the extreme northern point of the island, and the Sakonnet River Bridge, about 1 mile south of that point. The Sakonnet River Bridge is toll free. The Mount Hope Bridge has a one-way toll of 25 cents or a commutation toll of 10 cents.

A toll bridge across the west passage of Narragansett Bay from Saunterstown on the mainland to Conanicut Island in the bay, on which the town of Jamestown is located, was completed in 1940, and is now being operated as a toll facility. The authorizing act provided that the Jamestown Bridge would be toll free after the retirement of the revenue bonds issued for its construction, which will occur in 1964 or 1965 after which the bridge will become the property of the State and be free of tolls.

A toll ferry carries traffic across the east passage of Narragansett Bay between Jamestown and Newport.

The Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority was created by an act of the State legislature in 1954, with authority to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain bridges as toll facilities and to sell revenue bonds to finance its activities. At that time consideration was given to construction of a bridge across the east passage of Narragansett Bay between Jamestown and Newport, but it was not found to be economically feasible. In 1956, 1960, and 1963, the act creating the turnpike authority was amended, creating a new State agency with authority to take over the Jamestown Bridge and the Mount Hope Bridge, issue its revenue bonds to retire the outstanding bonds on those two bridges, and to extend and use the tolls therefrom to assist in financing the construction of a bridge from Jamestown to Newport.

Public Law 741, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 879), authorized the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, when it obtained title to the Jamestown Bridge, to combine that bridge with any other bridge, bridges, structures, or approaches, and to charge and collect tolls in accordance with State law for the use of such bridges financed by the bridge authority, and to pledge the use of the tolls collected from the combined project also in accordance with the act creating the turnpike and bridge authority. The residents of Jamestown opposed that legislation, as the continuation of tolls on the Jamestown Bridge which was almost paid for, prevented free access to the mainland from the island. The Turnpike and Bridge Authority Act was amended in May 1963 to remove the Jamestown Bridge from the authority contained in said act, which will allow the Jamestown Bridge to become toll free in a short time and permit residents of Jamestown toll-free access to the mainland.

S. 1936 will amend the Mount Hope Bridge Act, by deleting the requirement that if the bridge be taken over by any municipality or other political subdivision or subdivisions of the State of Rhode Island, and if tolls are charged for the use thereof, the rates of tolls

shall be adjusted so as to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid for the bridge and its approaches within 25 years from the acquisition thereof.

The bill would provide that if and when title to the bridge becomes vested in the State of Rhode Island or the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, the maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge shall thereafter be governed by the laws of the State of Rhode Island, subject to the terms and conditions of the act of March 23, 1906.

This action will permit the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to continue the existing tolls on the Mount Hope Bridge at the present moderate rate, making possible the financial feasibility of the construction of the Newport-Jamestown Bridge across the east passage of Narragansett Bay. The revenues from the Mount Hope Bridge that will become available to the turnpike authority will amount to approximately \$400,000 annually. Without combining the income from the two facilities, Mount Hope Bridge and the proposed Newport-Jamestown Bridge, the project will not be financially possible.

The residents of Newport County are aware of the urgent need for the Newport-Jamestown Bridge, and voted overwhelmingly in favor of a referendum in 1960 which meant a continuation of tolls on the Mount Hope Bridge, which would enable the proposed bridge to be financed. If this bridge is not constructed, the present Newport-Jamestown ferry, which provides the only passage across Narragansett Bay to the western part of Rhode Island and to Connecticut and New York, must continue in operation. This ferry provides inadequate service and operates at an annual deficit of about \$250,000. The residents of the area feel that the proper economic development of the southern part of Rhode Island and neighboring area of Massachusetts, is curtailed because of the inaccessibility to the island of Aquidneck from the west.

No Federal-aid highway funds were involved or are involved in the construction of the Mount Hope Bridge.

The General Bridge Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 525-533) requires that if tolls are charged for use of an interstate bridge constructed or taken over by a State or States or any political subdivision thereof, rates must be sufficient to make the bridge free of tolls within 30 years. There is no statutory requirement under either the General Bridge Act of 1946 or the act of March 23, 1906, on the regulation of tolls on intrastate bridges. Since the Mount Hope Bridge is an intrastate bridge, deletion of a requirement for a sinking fund to amortize its cost is not believed to be at variance with existing general bridge laws. The laws of the State of Rhode Island provide adequate safeguards for the regulation of tolls, and the act of March 23, 1906, and the General Bridge Act of 1946, adequately protect the interests of navigation.

Mr. PASTORE. Action on the bill will permit the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to continue the existing tolls on the Mount Hope Bridge at the present moderate rate, making financially feasible the construction of the Newport-Jamestown Bridge across the east passage of Narragansett Bay.

I ask that the bill be passed.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am indeed glad that our bill S. 1936, authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay, subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906, has passed the Senate. It is a meritorious bill, go-

ing in an unexpected direction in this day of increasing Federal Government injection into local and State affairs, necessary to meet our mid-20th century problems.

The bill actually goes in the opposite direction and removes the Federal Government from the responsibility for supervision over various functions concerning an intrastate bridge, the Mount Hope Bay Bridge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1936) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act granting the consent of Congress to the Mount Hope Bridge Company, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Mount Hope Bay between the towns of Bristol and Portsmouth, in Rhode Island", approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1391), is amended by striking out section 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 3. If and when title to such bridge shall become vested in the State of Rhode Island or the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of said State, the maintenance, repair, and operation of such bridge shall thereafter be governed by the laws of the State of Rhode Island applicable to such bridge, subject, however, to the terms and conditions of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 23, 1906."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF SELECTED EXCERPTS ON 1963-64 HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE ON SUBJECT OF MEDICARE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Concurrent Resolution 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts on the 1963-64 national high school debate subject of medicare, which were, in line 9, strike out "twenty-five thousand six hundred and sixty-five" and insert "fifty-one thousand three hundred and thirty"; in lines 10 and 11, strike out "ten thousand three hundred" and insert "twenty thousand six hundred"; in lines 11 and 12, strike out "fifteen thousand three

hundred and sixty-five" and insert "thirty thousand seven hundred and thirty"; and to amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress relating to the 1963-1964 national high school debate subject of medicare."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand this involves a reprint of a document.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The concurrent resolution was passed by the Senate, and the House increased the number of the copies of the document involved.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, now that the two Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL] have done such valiant work with respect to S. 1936, having to do with the welfare of their State, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 426.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 277) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth sentence of section 508(a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)), is amended by striking out "in not to exceed 100 counties", and inserting in lieu thereof "in not to exceed 150 counties".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with the bill, I believe appropriate excerpts from the report should be printed in the RECORD. The distinguished Senator who reported the bill is present. I wonder if he would ask to have that done.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an appropriate excerpt from the report may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 277) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year, having considered

the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill is identical to S. 2859 which was considered and passed by the Senate on June 23, 1962. The bill was also considered and reported favorably by the House Committee on Agriculture on September 19, 1962. However, this was too late in the session for it to receive consideration by the House of Representatives.

This bill would permit Federal crop insurance to be offered in 150 additional counties each year. At present expansion is limited to 100 new counties each year.

Crop insurance is offered farmers in selected counties by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. This Corporation is wholly Government-owned and provides all-risk crop insurance protection against unavoidable causes of loss.

In 1948 the crop insurance program was placed on a limited, experimental basis to gain experience and accumulate actuarial data. This was done by Congress because of the adverse experience the crop insurance program had from 1938 to 1947 when it was on a national basis. During this experimental period (1948-61) expansion to new counties has been limited. In no year during this period did the number of new counties allocated approach the 100-county limitation. The objective was the development of a sound program that could be operated on a national basis.

Although expansion in the last 14 years has been limited, the Department feels that the experience gained during this period is sufficient to justify a more rapid rate of expansion so as to provide more farmers with the protection provided under the all-risk crop insurance program.

Table I summarizes the crop insurance operation for the crop year 1963.

TABLE 1—1963 crop year (estimated)

Number of counties.....	1,096
Number of county programs.....	2,379
Number of commodities insured.....	20
Number of crops insured.....	421,000
Premiums.....	\$28,500,000
Indemnities.....	\$25,600,000
Loss adjustment cost.....	\$1,050,000

In 1948, when the program was placed on a limited basis, the law provided that not more than seven commodities might be covered the first year and not more than three additional commodities each year thereafter. Table II shows the commodities now covered and the number of country programs in effect in 1963:

TABLE 11.—Commodities insured and number of county programs in effect in 1963

	County programs
Apples.....	3
Barley.....	164
Beans.....	26
Cherries.....	1
Citrus.....	12
Combined crop.....	26
Corn.....	380
Cotton.....	198
Flax.....	85
Grain sorghum.....	67
Oats.....	168
Peaches.....	19
Peanuts.....	33
Peas.....	13
Potatoes.....	9
Raisins.....	7
Rice.....	9
Soybeans.....	371
Tobacco.....	212
Tomatoes.....	3
Wheat.....	573

Total..... 2,379

Crop insurance is a program under which farmers pay a premium for the protection

they get against crop losses. Premiums in effect for the various crops are designed to cover losses and provide for a reasonable reserve, but not administrative costs, although some administrative costs are paid out of premium income.

The total cost of the program, including administrative expenses, since its inception

in 1938, amounts to \$202,061,804. Of this, \$68,506,130 are the losses experienced because indemnities and other costs charged against premiums exceeded premiums.

However, for the period 1948-62 premiums exceeded indemnities and other costs paid out of premiums by \$4,493,870. During this period \$5,711,958 in loss adjustment costs

and \$3,574,569 in administrative costs were paid out of premiums.

Administrative costs (appropriated) for the entire period 1938-62 amounts to \$133,555,674. Of this, \$87,728,600 is chargeable to the 1948-63 period.

Table III shows complete data on the program from its inception:

TABLE III.—Income and expenses, 1939-62

Crop year	Number contracts in force	Program operations							Administrative cost (appropriated)	Surplus or deficit (-), including administrative cost
		Premiums (income)	Indemnities (cost)	Provision for uncollectible accounts (cost)	Income from commodity transactions	Loss adjustment cost	Administrative cost charged to program	Other net income (not distributed)		
1938.....									\$234,546	—\$234,546
1939.....	165,775	\$3,410,940	\$5,601,562		—\$1,418			—\$2,192,040	4,351,672	—6,543,712
1940.....	360,596	9,155,000	13,694,264		—175,210			—4,714,474	5,650,839	—10,365,313
1941.....	371,390	7,096,349	18,924,481		4,182,655			—7,645,477	5,028,729	—12,674,206
1942.....	462,019	14,747,185	24,936,874	\$93,750	1,946,845			—8,336,594	6,775,802	—15,112,396
1943.....	422,420	17,459,455	33,231,256	281,250	776,532			—15,276,519	6,447,732	—21,724,251
Total, 1938-43.....	1,782,200	51,868,929	96,388,437	375,000	6,729,404			\$28,628	—38,136,476	—66,625,796
1944.....	(1)								1,708,605	—1,708,605
1945.....	151,341	9,273,559	23,245,858	136,938	87,000			—14,022,237	2,502,248	—16,524,485
1946.....	364,569	33,091,352	63,488,727	493,062	2,237,370			—28,653,067	6,210,990	—34,864,057
1947.....	397,931	40,648,690	35,243,844	1,353,801	3,128,432			7,179,477	6,915,911	263,566
Total, 1944-47.....	910,841	83,013,601	121,978,429	1,983,801	5,452,802			632,303	—34,863,524	—52,201,278
Total, 1938-47.....	2,693,041	134,882,530	218,366,866	2,358,801	12,182,206			660,931	—73,000,000	—118,827,074
1948.....	169,125	12,683,974	6,754,015	63,500	—25,937			5,840,522	4,284,468	1,556,054
1949.....	165,076	11,501,239	15,530,993	57,600	231,981			—3,855,373	4,010,701	—7,866,074
1950.....	306,685	14,103,899	12,798,839	71,600				1,233,460	4,780,354	—3,546,894
1951.....	343,210	19,110,633	21,338,643	194,000				—2,422,010	5,583,014	—8,005,024
1952.....	340,686	21,200,815	20,609,019	212,000				379,796	5,952,023	—5,572,227
1953.....	406,630	27,097,685	31,056,228	271,000				—4,229,543	6,706,607	—10,936,150
1954.....	346,887	22,654,797	28,030,713	227,000				—5,602,916	5,940,033	—11,542,949
1955.....	319,958	22,329,676	25,504,643	223,000		\$534,232		—3,932,199	5,810,356	—9,742,555
1956.....	324,949	22,139,250	27,890,137	221,000		913,224	\$138,254	—7,023,365	6,210,016	—13,233,381
1957.....	307,604	17,407,504	12,003,808	174,000		751,423		4,478,273	6,210,000	—1,731,727
1958.....	324,435	17,616,315	4,504,805	176,000		485,660	172,260	12,277,590	6,376,700	5,900,890
1959.....	339,463	18,461,773	14,137,841	185,000		710,096	400,851	3,027,985	6,376,700	—3,348,715
1960.....	330,448	17,796,931	10,316,173	143,000		618,012	486,306	6,233,440	6,376,700	—143,260
1961.....	320,292	18,149,059	16,093,470	145,000		649,311	618,821	642,457	6,561,000	—5,918,543
1962.....	363,760	21,867,345	23,966,775	175,000		1,050,000	1,758,077	—5,082,507	6,549,928	—11,632,435
Total, 1948-62.....	4,709,208	284,120,895	270,536,102	1,464,408	206,044	5,711,958	3,574,569	1,453,968	4,493,870	87,728,600
Grand total, 1938-62.....	7,402,249	419,003,425	488,902,968	3,823,209	12,388,250	5,711,958	3,574,569	2,214,899	—68,506,130	133,555,674

¹ No insurance.

² Includes miscellaneous income items for interest earned on premiums, nonrefund-

able credits, and miscellaneous prior year adjustments of premiums, indemnities, and provision for uncollectible accounts.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, before the calendar is considered, may I ask the distinguished majority leader for a little more explicit statement concerning the program for next week than he gave us yesterday afternoon?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], it is the intention of the leadership to lay before the Senate at the conclusion of business today Calendar No. 434, S. 1716, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which will be the unfinished business when the Senate returns on Tuesday next after its brief meeting on next Friday. As of now, and subject to correction, that will be followed by consideration of Calendar No. 425, S. 1915, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the majority leader for this information.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a call of the calendar for consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 428.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first measure, Calendar No. 428.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1756) to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the word "him", to insert "on June 30, 1963,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Alaska Public Works Act (63 Stat. 627, 628; 48 U.S.C. 486c) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "": Provided, That notwithstanding the requirements of this sentence, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to collect, or as he may determine to be justified by the special financial condition of the applicant or other unusual circumstances, to compromise or release any claim or obligation assigned to or held by him on June 30, 1963, in connection with any such agreement until such time as such claim or obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection: Provided further, That the Secretary may delegate to the head of any other department or agency of the United States any of his functions, powers, and duties with respect to such collection, compromise, or release of claims or obligations as he may deem appropriate, and may authorize the redelegation of such functions, duties, and powers by the head of such department or agency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

S. 1756: JUST, NEEDED LEGISLATION

Mr. BARTLETT subsequently said: Mr. President, I am pleased that today the Senate has passed S. 1756, a bill to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise or release certain claims held by him under that act. I introduced this measure on June 20 in behalf of the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] as well as myself. Representative RIVERS has introduced a companion measure in the other body.

S. 1756 was carefully considered and reported by the Senate Public Works Committee.

The Alaska Public Works program was of very great assistance to what was then the Territory of Alaska. Authorized August 24, 1949, it was extended through June 30, 1959. During this period close to \$70 million was allocated across Alaska for the construction of streets, schools, water systems and other much needed public projects.

Under the terms of the program, applicants were required to repay half the allocations over periods ranging from 20 to 30 years. Already, but 4 years from the expiration of the program, more than half the total indebtedness of over \$31 million has been repaid. The repayment record of Alaska local governing bodies has been excellent.

In three cases, however, three small cases, repayment according to the original indebtedness agreement would cause severe hardship for the communities involved. These communities are Hoonah, Skagway, and Haines.

In the city of Skagway, \$160,000 was spent on making street improvements. This included grading, crushed stone surfacing, and drainage facilities. The surfacing technique which was used by the firm undertaking the project was experimental and, as it turned out, faulty. Large chuckholes soon developed in the streets; the condition of the streets was worse than ever. The Alaska public works program expired before a repair contract could be entered into. Skagway is a small city of but 700 citizens. Its annual budget is but \$81,000. It has barely been able to keep its streets in passable condition and does not have the money to maintain both its faulty streets and repay its share of Alaska public works funds.

In the community of Hoonah, \$72,000 was spent in 1951 on a water supply project. Hoonah has a population of about 680. The annual income which Hoonah receives from its water system is not even sufficient to cover the minimum maintenance costs of the system and cannot be stretched to meet the payments due the United States. Under the terms of the Alaska Public Works Act the community is required to divert property tax revenues to pay U.S. obligations. However, for technical reasons beyond the control of the town, very little of the community's property is on tax rolls. The community is unable to pay its Alaska public works debts.

The Haines school was built by the Alaska public works program. The roof was not properly laid according to the specifications. As a result the Haines

Independent School District has been forced to replace the roof at a cost of \$6,000. This unforeseen and inexcusable expense has interfered with the ability of this body to meet its payments.

Through inadvertance and contrary to usual practice the act authorizing the Alaska program made no provision for the settlement of payments and indebtedness after the expiration of the program. The bill before the Senate today corrects this deficiency. It simply authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to collect or settle by compromise or release these three claims.

This bill was drawn up in close cooperation with the Department of the Interior, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Bureau of the Budget. All favor the enactment of this bill which is, in fact, a simple housekeeping measure.

I was pleased to sponsor the original proposal to establish the Alaska public works program. The program has now been completed. This legislation is necessary to see that the obligations existing still are handled in a businesslike manner.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 452), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 1756, as amended, is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, either directly or through another appropriate Federal agency, to collect or settle by compromise or release, claims of the United States against cities and other Alaska public bodies arising out of agreements entered into between the United States and such public bodies pursuant to the Alaska Public Works Act (63 Stat. 627, 628), held by him on June 30, 1963.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949, authorized a program of useful public works to assist in the development of the Territory of Alaska. Under the provisions of the act, the Administrator of General Services was authorized to construct various public works and transfer these to applicant public bodies in Alaska pursuant to agreements under which the applicant would agree to pay not less than 25 percent and not more than 75 percent of the cost of such works. The act further required that the aggregate amount to be recovered under all agreements thereunder should not be less than 50 percent of the aggregate cost of all works provided by the United States.

The act authorized the appropriation of \$70 million to carry out its provisions, and included a termination date of June 30, 1955. Functions of the Administrator of General Services under the act were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 15 of 1950.

Upon appropriation of funds for carrying out the purposes of the act, in the early stages, the territory, larger cities, and other public agencies that were in a favorable position took advantage of the provisions included therein, and planned and completed numerous projects. Some of the smaller schools and other districts were not capable of acting with such rapidity, and their programs lagged, with a resulting balance of authorization remaining near the expiration date of the act. The date for termination of the act was extended to June 30, 1959, by Public Law 498, 83d Congress (68 Stat. 483).

The act was further amended and clarified by Public Law 233, 85th Congress (71 Stat. 515), to facilitate its administration by providing expressly that the Secretary of the Interior shall have authority to convey both public and acquired lands of the United States which had been utilized in the furnishing of public works, after transfer of jurisdiction over the lands for that purpose, to purchasers of the public works. It also granted authority to the Secretary to include in conveyances a reservation of minerals and a right of reversion in case the grantee public body should fail to utilize the land for the purpose for which granted, and included provisions to validate and confirm previous conveyances in connection with the program.

The terms of the Alaska Public Works Act did not include provisions for the settlement of payments and indebtedness after the expiration of the program. This is not in accord with the usual practice of designating a Government agency to handle the housekeeping and closing-out functions of a program after its expiration. This function is now being performed by the Office of Territories, of the Department of the Interior, although Alaska is no longer a territory.

Almost all of the authorization of \$70 million for the program was expended, half of which was to be repaid over periods of from 20 to 30 years. In general, the repayment record of the Alaska communities which participated in the program has been good. More than half of the total indebtedness of over \$31 million has already been repaid.

In certain cases, because of the work transferred, or the unusually difficult state of the city's finances, repayment of indebtedness according to the terms of the original agreement involves a particular hardship for the community concerned. Under the existing law, the Secretary of the Interior lacks authority to deal adequately with these special situations, even though settlement or compromise of the indebtedness might clearly be the most appropriate means of final disposition. S. 1756 would permit the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate and make such final settlement as he deemed justified, and to make the fullest use of Federal agencies or departments, such as the Housing and Home Finance Agency, having particular knowledge in connection with similar transactions.

The committee was advised that there have been three cases in the past in which disputes of payment have arisen, that could be negotiated and settled under the provisions of S. 1756. The total amount of these outstanding claims is \$238,000.

AMENDMENT

The committee recommends an amendment to S. 1756, that would make its provisions applicable only for settlement of claims existing on June 30, 1963, to prevent perpetuation of the settlement authority granted by the act. Any future claims would be processed by the Attorney General of the United States.

FEDERAL COST

The three outstanding claims now pending that could be settled under the provisions of S. 1756 total \$238,000.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee is aware of the tremendous value of the Alaska public works program in providing community facilities to communities in the Territory and State of Alaska. As in other construction programs in Alaska, construction costs were high and local material was used wherever practicable. In several cases, however, the unexpected deterioration of the work transferred, which required heavy maintenance or replacement costs to local public bodies, created a particular hardship to meet the repayment of the indebtedness. The financial resources of many of the communities and public bodies in Alaska are extremely limited, and additional burdens placed on them are often

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 28, 1963

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AN ACT

To amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the fourth sentence of section 508 (a) of the Federal
4 Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1508 (a)), is
5 amended by striking out “in not to exceed 100 counties”,
6 and inserting in lieu thereof “in not to exceed 150 counties”.

Passed the Senate August 28, 1963.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,

Secretary.

AN ACT

To amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

August 28, 1963

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Washington, D. C. 20250

Official business Postage and fees paid
U. S. Department of Agriculture

Issued July 28, 1964

For actions of July 27, 1964

88th-2nd; No. 143

CONTENTS

Agricultural land.....1	Economy.....15	National park.....1,10
Appalachia.....12	Education.....6	Poverty.....11
Appropriations.....7	Ethics.....20	Public lands.....8
ASC Committeemen.....1	Fisheries.....18	Reclamation.....4
Cantaloups.....14	Flour.....9	Recreation.....5
Containers.....2	Foreign aid.....19	Saline water.....17
Corn.....13	Lands.....4,8	Taxes.....16
Crop insurance.....1	Meat imports.....3	Wheat.....9

HIGHLIGHTS: House subcommittee voted to report bills to: Extend technical help in community projects; Increase crop insurance counties; and re election and function of ASC committeemen. Senate began debate on bill with meat-import restrictions. Senate subcommittees voted to report independent offices appropriation bill and Public Land Review Commission bill.

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 5406, with amendment, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States in planning changes in use of agricultural land; H. R. 9178, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act regarding election and functioning of ASC committeemen; S. 277, to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered; and H. R. 8290, with amendment, to accept a transfer of certain lands within Everglades National Park. p. D593
2. CONTAINERS. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. R. 6413, to permit the sale in D.C. of milk and ice cream and other frozen dairy products in smaller containers than now permitted. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 16400

SENATE

3. MEAT IMPORTS. Began debate on H. R. 1839, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States, including an amendment which would impose quotas on the importation of meat and meat products. pp. 16495-505

4. RECLAMATION. Both Houses received a letter from Interior reporting that a soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Clear Creek South Unit, Trinity River Division, Central Valley project, Calif., and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops. pp. 16420, 16421

The Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee approved for full committee consideration the Moss substitute to S. 1658, authorizing construction and operation of the Central Arizona project, Arizona and New Mexico. p. D592

5. RECREATION. Sen. Douglas urged approval of S. 2249, to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and inserted an editorial praising the bill as "a realistic and workable compromise." pp. 16438-9

6. EDUCATION. Sen. Hartke inserted a letter praising the work-study provisions of S. 2490, the college student assistance bill. p. 16439

7. APPROPRIATIONS. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved with amendments for full committee consideration H. R. 11296, the independent offices appropriation bill. p. D592

8. PUBLIC LANDS. The Public Lands Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved with amendments for full committee consideration H. R. 8070, to establish a Public Land Law Review Commission, and H. R. 5498, authorizing the sale of public lands not needed for Federal program requirements. p. D592

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

9. WHEAT; FLOUR. Rep. Findley inserted an article, "Freeman Blunders on Wheat, Flour Prices..." pp. A3904-5
10. NATIONAL PARK. Extension of remarks of Rep. McFall inserting Rep. Johnson's speech in which he traced the history of Yosemite National Park. pp. A3906-7
11. POVERTY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Pucinski inserting an article "which clearly and concisely marshals the arguments as to why President Johnson's bold program to reduce poverty in this country is urgently needed." pp. A3907-8
12. APPALACHIA. Extension of remarks of Rep. Schwengel inserting excerpts from a radio interview in which Rep. Mahon expressed his opinion that the proposed Appalachian bill is "too ambitious." p. A3910
13. CORN. Extension of remarks of Sen. Hartke praising the development of a high-protein corn and inserting an editorial noting the great possibilities for use of this corn in underdeveloped nations. pp. A3893-4
14. CANTALOUPS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Yarborough and insertion of an article praising the qualities of Pecos Valley, Tex., cantaloups. p. A3896
15. ECONOMY. Rep. Udall inserted an article outlining the posture of the Nation's economy. pp. A3897-9
16. TAXES. Sen. Johnston and Rep. Pucinski inserted an article by Paul Samuelson showing the salutary effects on the economy of the tax cut. pp. A3900-1, A3903

Aug 5, 1964

15. CONTAINERS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H.R. 5673, to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the U. S. from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel. p. 17668
16. ELECTRIFICATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution to send to conference S. 1007, to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. p. 17668
17. TARIFF. The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 12253, to correct certain errors in the U. S. Tariff Schedule. p. D646
18. THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 9178, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act regarding election and functioning of ASC committeemen; S. 277, to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered; H. R. 8290, with amendment, to accept a transfer of certain lands within Everglades National Park; H. R. 3607, to define "screenings" under the Federal Seed Act to include materials containing less than 25 percent of agricultural or vegetable seeds; and H. R. 5406, with amendment, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States in planning changes in use of agricultural land. p. D644
19. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 2337, with amendment, to provide for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton River Basin Federal reclamation project, Ida.; and H. R. 5118, with amendment, to authorize the construction and operation of the Whitestone Coulee unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project, Wash., for irrigation, conservation, and recreational purposes. p. D645
20. DAIRY; WATERSHEDS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture Committee postponed action on S. 1915, to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk; and approved five watershed projects. p. D644

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

21. PAY; PERSONNEL. Speech in the House by Rep. Udall during debate on the Federal pay bill and insertion of a table which shows percent increases. pp. A4122-3
22. FOREST PRODUCTS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Metcalf inserting a summary of a report on the future of Mont.'s forest products industry. pp. A4125-6
23. FARM LABOR. Extension of remarks of Rep. Martin urging that the Calif. Council of Growers support legislation to continue the Mexican farm labor program. p. A4126
24. EMPLOYMENT. Rep. Findley inserted an editorial pointing out opportunities in agriculture if agriculture is defined to include jobs in private employment related to agriculture. pp. A4136-7
25. SOIL RESOURCES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Philbin describing the benefits from his bill, H. R. 5406, the soil and water resources development bill. pp. A4137-8
26. POVERTY. Rep. Conte inserted a paper suggesting that grants and loans to small industries might be an effective tool in the war against poverty. pp. A4138-9

Rep. Madden inserted an article showing the benefits Rep. Roybal derived from the Civilian Conservation Corps. p. A4140

Rep. Brademas inserted an article by Ralph McGill claiming that it is the Goldwater Republicans who are playing politics with the poverty bill and not the Administration. pp. A4140-1

BILLS INTRODUCED

27. TARIFF. H. R. 12253, by Rep. Mills, to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States; to Ways and Means Committee.
28. PERSONNEL. H. R. 12258, by Rep. Broyhill, Va., to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
29. MEAT IMPORTS. H. Res. 816, to provide for the concurrence of the House of Representatives to the Senate amendments to H. R. 1839; to Rules Committee.

PRINTED HEARINGS RECEIVED BY THIS OFFICE

30. RECREATION. S. 2048, establishment of the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area. S. Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
31. PROPERTY; FEDERAL AID. Real property acquisition practices and adequacy of compensation in Federal and federally assisted programs; 2 parts; field hearings. H. Public Works Committee.
32. PERSONNEL. H. R. 8544 and H. R. 5376, retirement credit and fringe benefits for Federal-State service. H. Post Office and Civil Service.
33. NATURAL RESOURCES; FORESTRY. Geological survey program review. H. Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
34. MANPOWER. S. J. Res. 105, S. 2298, S. 2427, and S. 2623, Nation's manpower revolution - National Commission on Automation and Technological Progress (Part 10). S. Labor and Public Welfare Committee.
35. CIVIL RIGHTS. H. Res. 789, to provide that the civil rights bill shall be taken from the Speaker's table and the Senate amendments agreed to; H. Rules Com.
36. ROADS. S. 2968, disaster road program. S. Public Works Committee.
37. MEAT IMPORTS. To restrict imports of beef, part 2. S. Finance Committee.
38. FISHERIES. H. R. 2392, etc., to initiate a program for the conservation and development of anadromous fish. H. Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
39. LANDS. H. R. 5159, H. R. 5498, and H. R. 8070, public land laws. S. Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
40. RESEARCH. National Oceanographic program, 1965. H. Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
41. APPALACHIA. H. R. 11065 and H. R. 11066, proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964. H. Public Works.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Washington, D. C. 20250

Official business Postage and fees paid
U. S. Department of Agriculture

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued Aug. 12, 1964
For actions of Aug. 11, 1964
88th-2nd No. 156

CONTENTS

Alaska centennial.....4	Flood control.....38	Opinion poll.....13
Appropriations.13,14,15,27	Food additives.....21	Peanuts.....31
ASC committeemen.....8	Food stamps.....1	Poverty.....22,32
Broom imports.....18	Foreign aid.....23,29	Public Law 480.....3
Census.....36	Forestry.....39	Recreation.....19,25,26,30
Coffee imports.....17	Fruits and vegetables...27	Research.....31
Community development...10	Hay.....34	Safety standards.....27
Consumers.....28	Housing loans.....24	Seed-screening.....7
Containers.....27	Information.....12	Taxation.....16
Crop insurance.....6	Lands.....26,39	Trade, foreign.....2,17,18
Disaster relief.....34	Loans.....24	Vehicles.....27
Expositions.....4,5	Meat imports.....2	Water resources.....9,35
Farm labor.....20,37	Military construction...15	Weather Bureau.....27
Farm loans.....11	National parks.....11	

HIGHLIGHTS: House concurred in Senate version of food-stamp bill. Meat-imports bill was sent to conference. House committee reported Public Law 480 bill. Senate concurred in House amendment to poverty bill. Senate debated foreign-aid authorization bill.

HOUSE

1. FOOD STAMPS. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 10222, to provide specific statutory authority for a food stamp plan. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 18325-8
2. MEAT IMPORTS. Voted to request a conference on H. R. 1839, the meat imports bill. House and Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 18311-25, 18452

3. PUBLIC LAW 480. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 12298, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (H. Rept. 1767). p. 18390
4. ALASKA CENTENNIAL. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. 49, to provide for establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission to study and report on the extent to which the U. S. should participate in the Alaska centennial celebration in 1967 (H. Rept. 1733). p. 18389
5. EXPOSITIONS. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 952, authorizing the President to call upon the States and foreign countries to participate in the International Exposition for southern Calif. (H. Rept. 1737). p. 18390
The Foreign Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11707, to provide for U. S. participation in the Canadian Universal International Exposition (H. Rept. 1738). p. 18390
6. CROP INSURANCE. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 277, to authorize extension of crop insurance to 150 additional counties per year rather than 100, as now provided (H. Rept. 1740). p. 18390
7. SEED-SCREENING IMPORTS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3607, to amend the Federal Seed Act so as to limit the importation of seed screenings (H. Rept. 1742). p. 18390
8. ASC COMMITTEEMEN. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9178, to limit terms and provide for staggered terms of ASC committeemen (H. Rept. 1743). p. 18390
9. WATER RESOURCES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 5118, to authorize the Whitestone Coulee unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Wash. (H. Rept. 1747). p. 18390
The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 9752, to preserve jurisdiction over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colo. River below Glen Canyon Dam. p. 18390
10. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 5406, to authorize this Department to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas (H. Rept. 1757). p. 18390
11. FARM LOANS; NATIONAL PARK. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 8290, to authorize addition of certain FHA-foreclosed lands to the Everglades National Park, Fla. (H. Rept. 1758). p. 18390
12. INFORMATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 9586, to provide for establishment of a National Council on the Arts to assist in development of the arts, including photography and motion pictures. p. 18390
13. D. C. APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 10199 (H. Rept. 1732). pp. 18268-9
14. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 11296. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 18271

EXPANSION OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE COVERAGE

AUGUST 11, 1964.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 277]

The Committee on Agriculture to whom was referred the bill (S. 277) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to permit the offering of Federal crop insurance in up to 150 new counties per year, instead of the 100 new counties to which the program is now limited.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

In 1948 the crop insurance program was rewritten by Congress and put on a limited and experimental-development basis. During this development period, certain limitations were placed on the scope and extent of the program, including the limitation that the program could not be expanded to more than 100 new counties each year.

Since this redirection of the program in 1948, a vast amount of beneficial experience has been had with this type of insurance and in the years 1948–62 premiums have exceeded indemnities under the program by more than \$13.7 million.

There is a substantial demand for crop insurance in many counties in which it is not available and the committee believes the time has arrived when the program may safely be expanded into more than 100 new counties each year. It, therefore, recommends in this bill that the limit be increased to 150 new counties per year.

COST

Some administrative costs of the crop insurance program are paid out of insurance premiums. Most of the administrative cost is paid from appropriation, however, and the additional cost to the Government of this bill would be the additional appropriation required to administer the programs in the additional new countries authorized by this legislation.

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

Enactment of the legislation is recommended by the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary's letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is included in the body of the Senate report which is set out below and made a part hereof:

SENATE REPORT

Following is the body of the Senate report which presents a brief but comprehensive summary of the crop insurance program and the need for this legislation.

This bill is identical to S. 2859, which was considered and passed by the Senate on June 23, 1962. The bill was also considered and reported favorably by the House Committee on Agriculture on September 19, 1962. However, this was too late in the session for it to receive consideration by the House of Representatives.

This bill would permit Federal crop insurance to be offered in 150 additional counties each year. At present expansion is limited to 100 new counties each year.

Crop insurance is offered farmers in selected counties by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. This Corporation is wholly Government-owned and provides all-risk crop insurance protection against unavoidable causes of loss.

In 1948 the crop insurance program was placed on a limited, experimental basis to gain experience and accumulate actuarial data. This was done by Congress because of the adverse experience the crop insurance program had from 1938 to 1947, when it was on a national basis. During this experimental period (1948-61) expansion to new counties has been limited. In no year during this period did the number of new counties allocated approach the 100-county limitation. The objective was the development of a sound program that could be operated on a national basis.

Although expansion in the last 14 years has been limited, the Department feels that the experience gained during this period is sufficient to justify a more rapid rate of expansion so as to provide more farmers with the protection provided under the all-risk crop insurance program.

Table I summarizes the crop insurance operation for the crop year 1963.

TABLE 1.—1963 crop year (estimated)

Number of counties.....	1, 096
Number of county programs.....	2, 379
Number of commodities insured.....	20
Number of crops insured.....	421, 000
Premiums.....	\$28, 500, 000
Indemnities.....	\$25, 600, 000
Loss adjustment cost.....	\$1, 050, 000

In 1948, when the program was placed on a limited basis, the law provided that not more than seven commodities might be covered the first year and not more than three additional commodities each year thereafter. Table II shows the commodities now covered and the number of county programs in effect in 1963.

TABLE 11.—Commodities insured and number of county programs in effect in 1963

Commodity	County programs	Commodity	County programs
Apples.....	3	Peanuts.....	33
Barley.....	164	Peas.....	13
Beans.....	26	Potatoes.....	9
Cherries.....	1	Raisins.....	7
Citrus.....	12	Rice.....	9
Combined crop.....	26	Soybeans.....	371
Corn.....	380	Tobacco.....	212
Cotton.....	198	Tomatoes.....	3
Flax.....	85	Wheat.....	573
Grain sorghum.....	67		
Oats.....	168	Total.....	2, 379
Peaches.....	19		

Crop insurance is a program under which farmers pay a premium for the protection they get against crop losses. Premiums in effect for the various crops are designed to cover losses and provide for a reasonable reserve, but not administrative costs, although some administrative costs are paid out of premium income.

The total cost of the program, including administrative expenses, since its inception in 1938, amounts to \$202,061,804. Of this, \$68,506,130 are the losses experienced because indemnities and other costs charged against premiums exceeded premiums.

However, for the period 1948–62 premiums exceed indemnities and other costs paid out of premiums by \$4,493,870. During this period, \$5,711,958 in loss adjustment costs and \$3,574,569 in administrative costs were paid out of premiums.

Administrative costs (appropriated) for the entire period 1938–62 amounts to \$133,555,674. Of this, \$87,728,600 is chargeable to the 1948–63 period.

Table III shows complete data on the program from its inception.

TABLE III.—*Income and expenses, 1939-62*

Crop year	Number contracts in force	Program operations						Net surplus or deficit program	Administrative cost (appropriated)	Surplus or deficit (-), including administrative cost
		Premiums (income)	Indemnities (cost)	Provision for uncollectible accounts (cost)	Income from commodity transactions	Loss adjustment cost	Administrative cost charged to program			
1938										
1939	165,775	\$3,410,940	\$5,601,562		—\$1,418			—\$2,192,040	\$234,546	—\$234,546
1940	360,596	9,155,000	13,694,264		—175,210			4,714,474	4,351,672	—6,543,712
1941	371,390	7,096,349	18,924,481		4,182,655			—7,645,477	5,650,839	—10,365,313
1942	462,019	14,747,185	24,936,874	\$93,750	1,946,845			—8,336,591	5,028,729	—12,674,206
1943	422,420	17,459,455	33,231,256	281,250	776,532			—15,276,519	6,775,802	—15,112,396
Total, 1938-43	1,782,200	51,868,929	96,388,437	375,000	6,729,404			—38,136,476	28,489,320	—66,625,796
1944	(1)									
1945	151,341	9,273,559	23,245,858	136,938	87,000			—14,022,237	1,708,605	—1,708,605
1946	301,569	33,091,352	63,438,727	493,062	2,237,370			—28,053,067	2,502,248	—16,524,485
1947	397,931	40,648,690	35,243,844	1,353,801	3,128,432			7,179,477	6,210,990	—34,864,057
Total, 1944-47	910,841	83,013,601	121,978,429	1,983,801	5,452,802			—34,863,524	17,337,754	—52,201,278
Total, 1938-47	2,693,041	134,882,530	218,366,866	2,358,801	12,182,206			—73,000,000	45,827,074	—118,827,074
1948	169,125	12,683,974	6,734,015	63,500	—25,937			5,840,522	4,284,468	1,556,054
1949	165,076	11,501,239	15,530,993	57,600	231,981			—3,855,373	4,010,701	—7,866,074
1950	306,685	14,103,899	12,798,839	71,600				1,233,460	4,789,354	—3,546,894
1951	343,210	19,110,633	21,338,643	194,000				—2,422,010	5,583,014	—8,005,024
1952	340,686	21,200,815	20,609,019	212,000				3,379,796	5,952,023	—3,572,227
1953	406,630	27,097,685	31,036,228	271,000				—4,229,543	6,706,607	—10,936,150
1954	346,887	22,654,797	28,030,713	227,000				—5,602,916	5,940,033	—11,542,949
1955	329,958	22,329,676	25,504,643	223,000		\$534,232		—3,923,199	5,810,356	—9,742,555
1956	324,949	22,139,250	27,890,137	221,000		913,224	\$138,254	—7,023,365	6,210,016	—13,233,381
1957	307,604	17,407,504	12,003,808	174,000		751,423		4,478,273	6,210,000	—1,731,727
1958	324,435	17,616,315	4,504,805	176,000		485,660	172,260	12,277,590	6,376,600	3,900,890
1959	339,463	18,461,773	14,137,841	185,000		710,096	400,851	3,027,985	6,376,700	—3,348,715
1960	330,448	17,796,931	10,316,173	143,000		618,012	486,306	6,233,440	6,376,700	—143,260
1961	320,292	18,149,059	16,093,470	145,000		649,311		642,457	6,561,000	—5,918,543
1962	363,760	21,867,345	23,966,775	175,000		1,050,000	1,758,077	—5,082,507	6,549,928	—11,632,435
Total 1948-62	4,709,208	284,120,895	270,536,102	1,464,408	206,044			4,493,870	87,728,600	—83,234,730
Grand total, 1938-62	7,402,249	419,003,425	488,902,968	3,823,209	12,388,250			—68,506,130	133,555,674	—202,061,804

¹ No insurance.² Includes miscellaneous income items for interest earned on premiums, nonrefundable credits, and miscellaneous prior year adjustments of premiums, indemnities, and provision for uncollectible accounts.

The Department of Agriculture favors enactment of this bill. The report on the bill from the Department follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1963.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of January 18, 1963, for a report on S. 277, a bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

The Department has no objection to the passage of this bill.

The bill provides for an increase in the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year from 100 to 150.

In 1948 the crop insurance program was placed on a limited, experimental basis to gain experience and accumulate actuarial data. This was done by Congress because of the adverse experience the crop insurance program had from 1938 to 1947 when it was on a national basis. During the period 1948-61, expansion to new counties has been limited. In no year during this period did the number of new counties allocated approach the 100-county limitation.

After 14 years of experience on a limited basis, expansion is progressing at a more rapid rate. For the 1962 crop year, 100 new counties were added to the program, and 100 additional counties have been allocated for the 1963 crop year. Current plans for 1964 also provide for expansion of the crop insurance program to 100 additional counties. If the limitation of new counties is increased from 100 to 150, it will permit expansion at a more rapid rate. The number of new counties that could be added to the program each year, would of course depend on the annual availability of funds for expansion of the crop insurance program.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, *Secretary.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in *italic*, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

* * * * * *

SEC. 508. To carry out the purposes of this title the Corporation is authorized and empowered—

(a) Commencing with crops planted for harvest in 1948, for the purpose of determining the most practical plan, terms, and conditions of insurance for agricultural commodities, if sufficient actuarial data are available, as determined by the Board, to insure, or to reinsure insurers of, producers of such agricultural commodities under any plan or plans of insurance determined by the Board to be adapted to any such commodity. Such insurance shall be against loss of the insured commodity due to unavoidable causes, including drought, flood, hail, wind, frost, winterkill, lightning, fire, excessive rain, snow, wildlife, hurricane, tornado, insect infestation, plant disease, and such other unavoidable causes as may be determined by the Board: *Provided*, That, except in the case of tobacco, such insurance shall not extend beyond the period the insured commodity is in the field. In 1948 insurance shall be limited to not more than seven agricultural commodities (including wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco) and to not more than three additional agricultural commodities in each year thereafter: *Provided*, That other agricultural commodities may be included in multiple crop insurance (insurance on two or more agricultural commodities under one contract with a producer). Beginning with crops planted for harvest in 1954, crop insurance may be offered each year in not to exceed [100] 150 counties in addition to the number of counties in which such insurance was offered in the preceding year. In determining the new counties in which such insurance is to be offered and the commodities to be insured, the Corporation shall take into consideration the demand of farmers for such insurance, the extent to which such insurance is available to commercial producers of insured commodities, and the anticipated risk of loss to the Corporation. Reinsurance for private insurance companies shall be limited to not to exceed twenty counties which may be selected without regard to the other county limitations specified herein. Any insurance offered against loss in yield shall not cover in excess of 75 per centum of the recorded or appraised average yield of the commodity on the insured farm for a representative period subject to such adjustments as the Board may prescribe to the end that the average yields fixed for farms in the same area, which are subject to the same conditions, may be fair and just: *Provided*, That if 75 per centum of the average yield represents generally more protection than the investment in the crop in any area, taking into consideration recognized farming practices, the Board shall reduce such maximum percentage so as more nearly to reflect the investment in the crop in such area. Insurance provided under this subsection shall not cover losses due to the neglect or malfeasance of the producer, or to the failure of the

producer to reseed to the same crop in areas and under circumstances where it is customary to so reseed, or to the failure of the producer to follow established good farming practices. Counties selected by the Board shall be representative of the several areas where the agricultural commodity insured is normally produced. The Board may limit or refuse insurance in any county or area, or on any farm, on the basis of the insurance risk involved. Insurance shall not be provided on any agricultural commodity in any county in which the Board determines that the income from such commodity constitutes an unimportant part of the total agricultural income of the county, except that insurance may be provided for producers on farms situated in a local producing area bordering on a county with a crop-insurance program. The Corporation shall report annually to the Congress the results of its operations as to each commodity insured.

(b) To fix adequate premiums for insurance in the agricultural commodity or in cash, at such rates as the Board deems sufficient to cover claims for crop losses on such insurance and to establish as expeditiously as possible a reasonable reserve against unforeseen losses: *Provided*, That such premiums may be established on the basis of the parity or comparable price for the commodity as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture, or on the basis of an average market price designated by the Board. Such premiums shall be collected at such time or times, or shall be secured in such manner, as the Board may determine.

(c) To adjust and pay claims for losses in the agricultural commodity or in cash, under rules prescribed by the Board: *Provided*, That indemnities may be determined on the same price basis as premiums are determined for the crop with respect to which such indemnities are paid. The Corporation shall provide for the posting annually in each county at the county courthouse of a list of indemnities paid for losses on farms in such county. In the event that any claim for indemnity under the provisions of this title is denied by the Corporation, an action on such claim may be brought against the Corporation in the United States district court, or in any court of record of the State having general jurisdiction, sitting in the district or county in which the insured farm is located, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such district courts to determine such controversies without regard to the amount in controversy: *Provided*, That no suit on such claim shall be allowed under this section unless the same shall have been brought within one year after the date when notice of denial of the claim is mailed to and received by the claimant.

(d) From time to time, in such manner and through such agencies as the Board may determine, to purchase, handle, store, insure, provide storage facilities for, and sell the agricultural commodity, and pay any expenses incidental thereto, it being the intent of this provision, however, that, insofar as practicable, the Corporation shall purchase the agricultural commodity only at the rate and to a total amount equal to the payment of premiums in cash by farmers or to replace promptly the agricultural commodity sold to prevent deterioration; and shall sell the agricultural commodity only to the extent necessary to cover payments of indemnities and to prevent deterioration: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall prevent prompt offset purchases and sales of the agricultural commodity for convenience in handling. Nothing in this section shall prevent the Corpo-

ration from accepting, for the payment of premiums, notes payable in the commodity insured, or the cash equivalent, upon such security as may be determined pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and from purchasing the quantity of the commodity represented by any of such notes not paid at maturity. The restriction on the purchase and sale of the agricultural commodity provided in this section shall be made a part of any crop insurance agreement made under this title. Notwithstanding any provision of this title, there shall be no limitation upon the legal or equitable remedies available to the insured to enforce against the Corporation the foregoing restriction with respect to purchases and sales of the agricultural commodity.

(e) In connection with insurance upon yields of cotton, to include provision for additional premiums and indemnity in terms of lint cotton to cover loss of cottonseed, such additional premium and indemnity to be determined on the basis of the average relationship between returns from cottonseed and returns from lint cotton for the same period of years as that used for computing yields and premium rates.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Corporation is hereby authorized, under such terms and conditions as it deems consistent with sound reinsurance principles, to provide reinsurance on any crop or plantation insurance provided in Puerto Rico by a duly authorized agency of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico: *Provided*, That, no application for reinsurance authorized herein shall be approved, unless the Corporation shall have determined that the reinsurance deemed necessary is not available from recognized private sources at reasonable cost.



88TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 277

[Report No. 1740]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 28, 1963

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AUGUST 11, 1964

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
and ordered to be printed

AN ACT

To amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the fourth sentence of section 508 (a) of the Federal
4 Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1508 (a)), is
5 amended by striking out “in not to exceed 100 counties”,
6 and inserting in lieu thereof “in not to exceed 150 counties”.

Passed the Senate August 28, 1963.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,

Secretary.

AN ACT

To amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

AUGUST 28, 1963

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AUGUST 11, 1964

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Washington, D. C. 20250

Official business Postage and fees paid

U. S. Department of Agriculture

Issued Sept. 2, 1964

For actions of Sept. 1, 1964

88th-2nd; No. 167

CONTENTS

Accounting.....27,32	Education.....13	Reclamation.....16
Administrative	Farm program.....3,25	Recreation.....1,11
conference.....30	Foreign currencies.....5	Research.....7
Alaska.....15	Fort Bowie.....33	Time system.....22
Appalachia.....19	Information.....23	Vehicles.....29
Appropriations.....10,31	Insecticides.....14	Vouchers.....27
Audit.....32	Lands.....12	Water resources.....8,17
Awards.....2	Legislative program.....19	Watersheds.....20
Containers.....28	Libraries.....18	Weather.....26
Cotton.....24	Parity ratio.....3	Wheat.....24
Crop insurance.....9	Personnel.....2	Wilderness.....6
Economics.....21	Poverty.....23	Wildlife.....14

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on land-water conservation fund bill. Sen. Mundt criticized drop in parity ratio. Sen. Young, O., commended administration farm policies. House committee voted to report water resources planning bill. House passed bill to increase number of counties eligible for crop insurance.

SENATE

1. RECREATION. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 3846, to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands (pp. 20512-14, 20604-9). This bill will now be sent to the President. See Digest 166 for a summary of items of interest.
2. PERSONNEL. The Foreign Relations Committee reported with amendment H. R. 12342, to authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U. S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries (S. Rept. 1520). p. 20560

3. PARITY RATIO. Sen. Mundt criticized the announced drop in the parity ratio to 74 percent and urged the administration to take measures to "strengthen the economy of our farmers." pp. 20571-2
4. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Young, O., commended administration farm policies as leading to farm prosperity, particularly for Ohio farmers. pp. 20562-3
5. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Sen. McGovern urged the use for idle foreign currencies accumulated under Public Law 480 to support additional programs in foreign countries, such as education, health, and family planning. p. 20565
6. WILDERNESS. Sen. McGovern inserted an editorial commending passage of the wilderness preservation bill. pp. 20565-6
7. RESEARCH. Sen. Anderson commended the establishment of a Science Policy Research Division in the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. pp. 20569-70
8. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Young, O., spoke in support of an expanded and accelerated water resource development program. pp. 20573-4

HOUSE

9. CROP INSURANCE. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 277, to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase from 100 to 150 the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 20530-33, D738
10. LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 10809. Senate conferees have already been appointed. pp. 20511-12
11. RECREATION. Conferees were appointed on S. 27, to provide for establishment of the Canyonlands National Park, Utah. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 20512
12. LANDS. Passed with amendment S. 2082, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a transfer of certain lands to the Everglades National Park, Dade County, Fla. H. R. 8290, a similar bill passed earlier under suspension of the rules, was tabled. pp. 20545-7
13. EDUCATION. Rep. Frelinghuysen objected to the request of Rep. Green, Ore., that S. 3060, to extend the National Defense Education Act and laws providing aid to schools in federally impacted areas, be sent to conference. p. 20514
14. WILDLIFE; INSECTICIDES. Passed 236 to 110, under suspension of the rules, H. R. 4487, to amend the Act of Aug. 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides. pp. 20525-30
Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 2392, to authorize a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States. pp. 20541-45
15. ALASKA. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 49, to provide for the establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission. pp. 20535-6

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I should like to call to the attention of the gentleman and to the attention of the House the fact that the Department of the Interior has this authority now under section 2 of Public Law 85-582 in the amount of \$2,565,000. They merely make the study, as it is now, and have no authority further than that.

This bill would increase the amount authorized to make the study and would direct them to report this to the Department of Agriculture. That is the difference.

Mr. WHITTEN. Which in turn could give them control. Public opinion could result in withdrawing essential materials, though not dangerous to the public health.

Mr. BONNER. Really, that is the difference.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire whether the gentleman from North Carolina has other speakers to whom he wishes to yield at this time?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is pretty hard to express yourself in 1 minute.

I concur with what the gentleman from Mississippi has said. I believe, as a matter of practical politics, we might as well accept this situation we are in now. I believe there is evidence that it will not be possible to get a two-thirds vote to pass the House bill, and there is agreement among most everyone who has some question about the House bill as to acceptance of the Senate version of the bill.

I believe that if you want to use some good judgment around here, we can have some agreement from the chairman of the committee that we can accept the Senate bill, after action is taken on this bill, and then we can get somewhere. The Senate proposal at least will provide for some progress, without the fear that some of us have about what is in the House bill.

That is all I have to say, as a matter of practicality.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional minute. I should like to ask a question.

Does the gentleman realize that all the Senate version of the bill would do is to increase the appropriation for the investigation, for which the Department of the Interior already has authority? They are not doing anything at all.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The point is that we need more investigation.

Despite what the chairman has said about clearing this with the Department of Agriculture this morning, the letter from the Secretary says that the Department recommends that no legislative action be taken at this time. The only legislative action we should take would be to adopt the Senate version of the bill.

Mr. BONNER. I tell the gentleman of the understanding I had this morning with the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, which was after the letter was printed. They said that at the time they did not understand the bill. That is practically what was said in my office this morning.

We would not be doing anything by accepting the bill to damage anyone.

Go ahead and defeat the bill, if you want to defeat it. If you want no progress in this area, defeat the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We will get progress, if we adopt the Senate version of the bill.

What I fear is the provision which would give to the Secretary of the Interior the authority to distribute the information to all interested persons and agencies, both public and private, as to data collected under the act, showing the effects and so forth. That might bring about the very thing the gentleman from Mississippi spoke about—all this "scare stuff" which costs the Government money.

Mr. BONNER. There is now in my area the Roanoke River which goes into Pamlico Sound. One chemical company turned loose enough chemicals to kill all the fish that had been produced there for 2 years.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA].

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. FUQUA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am confused as to what department will make the final decision if there is a dispute between departments. I would like to call on my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT], to respond.

Mr. ABBITT. I think undoubtedly the bill is not clear on this. From a casual glance at the language, it would appear that the Secretary of Agriculture must put on whatever he is directed to, by the Secretary of the Interior, but it is almost impossible to say which one is predominant. If you look at the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture on page 8 of the report, in the third paragraph from the bottom, it says:

The provisions of that part of the proposed amendment dealing with the labeling of products registered under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act would appear to create the possibility of a conflict of authority between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of the act.

Certainly, if the Secretary feels that way, the language must not be clear and it certainly would not be proper for us to pass this bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] has expired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the last inquiry propounded, the ultimate authority with respect to labeling still lies with the Secretary of Agriculture, but he can only accomplish it after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior with respect to possible toxic effects on fish and wildlife.

When the late great President Kennedy was still alive he created a blue ribbon panel to make recommendations on this subject. Here is their recommendation in a report dated May 15, 1963.

The panel recommends expanded research and evaluation by the Department of the Interior of the toxic effects of pesticides on wild vertebrates and invertebrates.

This is the recommendation of this blue ribbon committee of scientists. That is essentially what this bill does. It provides this kind of program, not a greatly expanded program, but a program sufficiently expanded to deal with some of these situations that have arisen. If you develop information and evaluate it you certainly want to make it operative. So we have provided that the Secretary of the Interior shall communicate his findings to the Secretary of Agriculture, and in fact, that the Secretary of Agriculture shall consult with him with respect to the effect of pesticides, fungicides, et cetera, on fish and wildlife.

Now, fish and wildlife are a peculiar responsibility of the Department of the Interior. The Department of Agriculture has a responsibility to the extent of residues and the effect on humans, and so forth, and the effect on animal feeds. But we are placing the responsibility for the effects on fish and wildlife with the agency which is concerned with fish and wildlife, and there is no duplication that occurs whatsoever.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman would agree that the effect on human consumption as far as canned goods are concerned and as far as the consumption of food and fiber stuffs from animal carcasses are concerned, that is also a proper consideration for the U.S. Public Health Service. Indeed this Congress has repeatedly put this function with them. We have endowed the National Institutes of Health copiously. They go into this regularly. They are in charge of the quarantining of all imported beef articles from overseas under the impact of the beef imports and otherwise and they even have photographic processes, if one wants to know what the U.S. Public Health Service is doing in the matter of quarantine.

I say to the gentleman that an additional amount of \$5 million per year as a political boondoggle is a poor answer as a sign of progress. I urge that this bill be voted down.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, my answer to the gentleman's question is this: I understand the gen-

tleman's concern with economy. Some of the gentlemen who have spoken do not object on the ground of economy, because the Senate bill provides the same amount of money and they approve of the Senate bill.

There is a conflict of authority presently between the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Agriculture, but this does not add to that confusion. This allocation of authority which goes to the Fish and Wildlife Service is in relation of pesticides to wildlife and is with the agency which now is most concerned with the viability of our fish and wildlife. We do not add any confusion whatsoever. If there is a present confusion between Food and Drug and Department of Agriculture, that has nothing to do with this bill.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4487) with amendments?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALL) there were—ayes 30, noes 29.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 236, nays 110, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

YEAS—236

Addabbo	Corman	Hagan, Ga.
Albert	Curtin	Hagen, Calif.
Ashley	Daddario	Halpern
Ashmore	Daniels	Hanna
Aspinall	Davis, Ga.	Harding
Baldwin	Dawson	Harrison
Barrett	Delaney	Harsha
Barry	Dent	Hawkins
Bates	Denton	Hechler
Battin	Derounian	Holifield
Becker	Dorn	Horton
Beckworth	Dowdy	Hosmer
Bennett, Fla.	Duncan	Ichord
Blatnik	Dwyer	Jarman
Boggs	Edmondson	Joelson
Boland	Edwards	Johnson, Calif.
Bolling	Elliott	Johnson, Pa.
Bonner	Ellsworth	Johnson, Wis.
Brademas	Fallon	Jonas
Brock	Farbstein	Karsten
Bromwell	Fascell	Karsh
Brooks	Feighan	Kastenmeier
Broomfield	Fino	Keith
Brown, Calif.	Fisher	King, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.	Flood	Kirwan
Burke	Fogarty	Knox
Burleson	Fountain	Kunkel
Burton, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Laird
Burton, Utah	Friedel	Latta
Byrne, Pa.	Fulton, Pa.	Leggett
Byrnes, Wis.	Fulton, Tenn.	Lennon
Cahill	Gallagher	Libonati
Cameron	Garmatz	Lindsay
Casey	Glaimo	Long, La.
Celler	Gibbons	Long, Md.
Clancy	Gilbert	McClary
Clark	Gonzalez	McCulloch
Clausen,	Goodell	McDade
Don H.	Goodling	McDowell
Clawson, Del.	Grabowski	McFall
Cleveland	Green, Oreg.	Macdonald
Cohen	Green, Pa.	Madden
Collier	Grover	Mailliard
Coley	Gubser	Mathias
Corbett	Gurney	Minish

Minshall	Quile
Monagan	Randall
Moore	Reuss
Morgan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Morrison	Rhodes, Pa.
Morse	Riehlman
Morton	Rivers, Alaska
Moss	Roberts, Ala.
Multer	Rodino
Murphy, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.
Murphy, N.Y.	Rogers, Fla.
Nelsen	Rogers, Tex.
Nix	Rooney, N.Y.
Norblad	Roosevelt
O'Brien, N.Y.	Rosenthal
O'Hara, Ill.	Rostenkowski
O'Hara, Mich.	Roudebush
O'Konski	Roush
Olsen, Mont.	Roybal
Olson, Minn.	Rumsfeld
O'Neill	Ryan, N.Y.
Osmer	St. Onge
Passman	Saylor
Patman	Schweiker
Patten	Secrest
Pelly	Shriver
Pepper	Sibal
Perkins	Sickles
Pickle	Skubitz
Pillion	Slack
Pirnie	Smith, Iowa
Powell	Snyder
Price	Stafford
Rucinski	Staggers

NAYS—110

Abbitt	Gary	Natcher
Abele	Gathings	Ostertag
Abernethy	Griffin	Poage
Adair	Gross	Poff
Andrews,	Haley	Pool
N. Dak.	Hall	Purcell
Arends	Halleck	Quillen
Ayres	Hardy	Reid, Ill.
Baker	Narris	Reifer
Beermann	Harvey, Ind.	Rice
Belcher	Henderson	Rivers, S.C.
Berry	Herlong	Roberts, Tex.
Betts	Hoever	Rooney, Pa.
Bolton,	Horan	St. George
Frances P.	Hull	Schadeberg
Bow	Hutchinson	Schenck
Bray	Jennings	Schneebell
Brotzman	Jensen	Schwengel
Brown, Ohio	Jones, Mo.	Selden
Broyhill, N.C.	Kilburn	Senner
Bruce	Kilgore	Short
Cederberg	King, N.Y.	Siler
Chamberlain	Kornegay	Smith, Calif.
Chelf	Kyl	Smith, Va.
Chenoweth	Langen	Springer
Conte	Lipscob	Stubblefield
Cunningham	McLoskey	Teague, Calif.
Curtis	McMillan	Tuck
Dague	MacGregor	Waggonner
Derwinski	Mahon	Watson
Devine	Marsh	Westland
Dole	Martin, Nebr.	Whalley
Downing	Matthews	Wharton
Dulski	May	Whitten
Everett	Michel	Wilson, Ind.
Findley	Milliken	Younger
Foreman	Mills	
Fuqua	Murray	

NOT VOTING—84

Alger	Gray	Morris
Anderson	Griffiths	Mosher
Andrews, Ala.	Hansen	Nedzi
Ashbrook	Harvey, Mich.	Philbin
Auchincloss	Hays	Pike
Avery	Healey	Pilcher
Baring	Hébert	Rains
Bass	Hoffman	Reid, N.Y.
Bell	Holland	Robison
Bolton,	Huddleston	Ryan, Mich.
Oliver P.	Johansen	St Germain
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Scott
Burkhalter	Kee	Sheppard
Carey	Kelly	Shipley
Colmer	Keogh	Sikes
Cramer	Kluczynski	Sisk
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Staebler
Diggs	Lankford	Stephens
Dingell	Lesinski	Stratton
Donohue	Lloyd	Teague, Tex.
Evins	McIntire	Thompson, N.J.
Finnegan	Martin, Calif.	Toll
Flynt	Martin, Mass.	Utt
Ford	Matsunaga	Wallhauser
Forrester	Meador	Williams
Fraser	Miller, Calif.	Wilson,
Gill	Miller, N.Y.	Charles H.
Glenn	Montoya	Winstead
Grant	Moorhead	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Scott with Mr. Staebler.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Martin of California.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Johansen.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Meador.
Mrs. Hansen with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Carey.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Healey.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Pike.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Nedzi.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Landrum with Mrs. Kelly.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Ryan of Michigan.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Moorhead.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Baring.

Messrs. MAHON and ROONEY of New York changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. DANIELS, GUBSER, BROYHILL of Virginia, KEITH, and JOELSON changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PESTICIDE RESEARCH

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1251) to amend the act of August 1, 1958, as amended, to increase the authorization for pesticide research by the Secretary of the Interior.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXPANSION OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE COVERAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 277) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth sentence of section 508(a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)), is amended by striking out "in not to exceed one hundred counties", and inserting in lieu thereof "in not to exceed one hundred and fifty counties".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is so simple that I am afraid some of the Members may decide that there is some hidden motive behind it. The bill makes only one change in existing law, and that is to change one figure from 100 to 150. The present law in regard to crop insurance provides that not more than 100 counties may be added each year to the list of counties in which crop insurance is sold. This bill would change that to 150 counties per year.

The reason for doing that is that the crop insurance program which has now been functioning rather soundly since 1948 is expanding and there are demands for crop insurance in additional counties—more than the 100 each year. It is felt that if we can safely expand it at a more rapid rate we can hope to reduce the cost and we can hope to put the program on a sounder basis.

To review for just a moment, we all recognize that insurance is a sound proposition only to the extent that you can spread the risk and that basically is all you do with insurance. When you have insurance over a larger area with more people involved you have a better program than when it is confined to a small area and a small number who are insured. On the other hand, we have long recognized that we should not move too rapidly. So for some 15 years we have been moving along rather slowly.

This proposed change will not accelerate the pace very much, but it will enable us to provide insurance to a great many counties where there is a demand for it and where we probably will be able to serve both the farmers and provide a sounder and less expensive program for the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, the committee believes that it is a sound program and that it is one which should be enlarged.

Mr. Speaker, this crop insurance program is not the issue. It is an established program, but I feel that the House should understand that crop insurance program now takes in more money in premiums each year than it pays out in losses.

The premiums since 1948 through 1962 have exceeded the indemnities by \$13.7 million.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish for anyone to understand that there has not been some cost to the Government as a result of the program. The Government

pays the administrative expenses through the operations of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, certainly.

Mr. COOLEY. The surplus or the profit now is more than sufficient to pay the administrative costs in the entire lifetime of the program as I understand it in my State of North Carolina.

Mr. POAGE. Doubtless that is correct for the gentleman's State, but I do not understand that to be true for the Nation as a whole. I wish it were.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, the administrative cost is an expensive item.

Mr. POAGE. I do not mean to disagree with the gentleman, but I feel that the membership should clearly understand that North Carolina has an especially good record. It is my understanding that the administrative cost over the entire country amounts to about \$5 million a year. That represents a profit of about \$1 million a year over the last 13 years.

Mr. COOLEY. I shall check that figure. However, I have seen just recently information to the effect that it was more than sufficient to pay the administrative costs in my State.

Mr. POAGE. I think it is clear that the gentleman is clearly right, that we are fast approaching the time when the premiums will pay all of the administrative costs. It is believed if we can widen this spread enough and do enough business, we can pay all of the administrative costs from the premiums. However, up until the present time I feel that we have to recognize the fact that we have not quite done this.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the very purpose of this amendment is to increase participation in the program?

Mr. POAGE. That is right, which is certainly the very thing that every private insurance company tries to do, increase their coverage, because through increasing their coverage they decrease their costs. It is just that simple, I will say to the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have a good, sound business proposition here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. Will the gentleman please inform the House as to the pending applications from counties which desire to have crop insurance?

Mr. POAGE. I do not know that I can tell the gentleman exactly how many counties desire to have it. There were last year 1,066 counties that did have it.

The reason we cannot say exactly how many are asking for it is because there is no official way to ask for it in any county except the counties that do have it. All you can do is talk if you want insurance in one of these counties which

has no program. So, there is never any application that gets in from a county that does not have it.

Mr. PIRNIE. If the gentleman will yield further, it is the position of the gentleman from Texas that a limitation will prevent a desire for participation in this insurance program?

Mr. POAGE. Unquestionably it has and unquestionably it will in the future, unless we increase this from 100 to 150 a year.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman.
A TRIBUTE TO JULIAN E. MANN—HE MADE CROP INSURANCE WORK FOR NORTH CAROLINA FARMERS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House today, by an overwhelming vote, finally passed and sent to the White House for the President's signature a bill greatly expanding the Federal crop insurance program. This legislation increases from 100 to 150 the number of new counties which may be brought into the program each year. The program now is operating in 1,187 counties.

I think this action of the House—I did not hear a single negative vote—is a tribute to those dedicated people, like Julian E. Mann, of North Carolina, who have made crop insurance work for the benefit of the farmers of America in their constant struggle against the hazards of nature.

It is a matter of great pride to me that I served as chairman of the subcommittee which prepared the first bill authorizing the crop insurance program many years ago.

The program had its difficulties in its formative years, for it explored areas where private insurance coverage hitherto had not been successful; but men like Julian E. Mann now have established this special service to agriculture on a sound and solid footing. The Crop Insurance Corporation showed an 83-percent increase in the protection for farmers in 1963 as compared with 1961. The operation now is showing a profit. The idea of crop insurance is accepted not only by farmers but by the public generally.

Mr. Speaker, the success story of crop insurance, and how one man—Julian E. Mann—has contributed to this achievement, is nowhere set forth so clearly as in a recent article by Bill Humphries, farm editor of the Raleigh, N.C., News & Observer.

I think that the Members of this body who today have voted so overwhelmingly for expansion of the crop insurance program will be interested in this success story. Therefore, with the permission of the House, I am inserting this News & Observer article at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

J. E. MANN: DIRECTOR, CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM

(By Bill Humphries)

In addition to its other agricultural firsts, North Carolina leads the Nation in the amount of financial protection provided its farmers under the Federal crop insurance program.

Last year, 37,490 farmers in 60 Tar Heel counties were provided protection totaling

almost \$69½ million. No other State even came close to that record.

State director of this highly successful program is 59-year-old Julian E. Mann of Raleigh, who has held the post since the State office was established in 1945.

To those who might be tempted to think of Federal crop insurance as "just another Government subsidy program for farmers," Mann has a quick reply.

NO SUBSIDY

First, he points out, other than administrative costs there is no subsidy involved. Insured farmers pay premiums just as they would for insurance with a private firm. In North Carolina, during the 19-year period from 1945 through 1963, premiums collected totaled \$15,139,639, while indemnity payments to farmers for crop losses amounted to \$8,840,508.

The surplus on hand at the end of 1963 was \$6,299,130, enough to pay the administrative costs of the program from its beginning to the present time.

There have been, in fact, only 3 years in which indemnity payments exceeded premium income. They were 1950, when the cotton crop in the Cleveland-Rutherford-Polk area was hit by excessive rains and by rampaging boll weevils; 1953, when drought took a \$2 million bite out of the tobacco crop in several northern Piedmont counties; and 1962, when extremely heavy rains dealt a severe blow to tobacco and other crops in Beaufort and other eastern counties.

WHAT'S OFFERED

Federal crop insurance offers the grower protection against natural disasters over which he has no control. Nationally, indemnities have been paid for more than 20 different types of losses. Drought has accounted for 39 percent of claims paid out; excessive moisture, 14 percent; insects, 11 percent; hail, 10 percent; frost or freeze, 10 percent.

Protection is limited by law to the amount of the farmer's investment in his crop, including labor and other production costs, or to the value of three-fourths of his average yield, whichever is less.

Federal insurance on crops does not compete with any type of protection offered by commercial companies, Mann says.

"We recommend that all our insureds take hail, or hail with wind, insurance on their growing crops, and on other risks after crops are harvested, through their local insurance agent. We believe that most of our tobacco insureds take such other insurance. By doing so, they diversify their insurance program in the same way that they diversify their farm operations."

PROTECTION ON TOBACCO

Over 90 percent of the protection in North Carolina is on tobacco, with insurance on this crop available in 56 counties. Cotton insurance is offered in 27 counties, peanuts in 8, peaches in 6, soybeans in 4, and corn in 2.

"Protection on one or more crops is available this year in 63 counties," Mann says. "Even though the program is extensive, our staff includes only 36 full-time people and about 100 part-time employees, including clerks in our 46 county offices."

Cost of Federal crop insurance varies by counties according to the amount of claims paid out. A farmer in a county with a low record of losses pays a relatively small premium. Also, discounts are offered to individuals with low loss records.

To protect the investment in his tobacco crop, a typical Tar Heel farmer pays from \$20 to almost \$30 per acre for Federal insurance. But in Wilson County, which has had very few losses on tobacco since 1945, many growers pay only \$6 to \$7 an acre. Wilson has the lowest rate of any U.S. county offering tobacco insurance.

EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

All-risk Federal crop insurance, now in its 26th year, began as an experimental program and is still operated on that basis.

Wise old Benjamin Franklin advocated crop insurance as early as 1788, but it was not until well over a century later, in 1899, that a private firm in Minnesota tried the idea. The experiment ended in failure, as did several similar ones about the time of World War I and later.

The destructive potential of Mother Nature is very great. Drought, excessive rain, diseases, insects, heat, freeze, and similar disasters can ravage a wide area in a single year. The forces of disaster seem to lurk just off-stage every year.

High production costs put a higher price tag on crop failure today than in the 1930's when Federal crop insurance was started. The capital required in modern farming, and the narrow profit margins involved, mean that many farmers cannot survive even one severe crop catastrophe unless they have insurance.

The high risks involved in crop insurance have dimmed the profit lure for private firms. Today there is no private company which offers the farmer crop insurance against all natural hazards. This is true even though the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation offers reinsurance within certain limits to any firm wishing to begin such a program.

Realizing the inherent risks in crop insurance, the U.S. Congress has purposely limited the scope of the Federal program. At first it was offered in only a few counties, and expansion from year to year has been on a very gradual basis.

Distress caused by crop losses affects the entire community. Indemnity dollars paid out under the Federal program have saved many businessmen as well as farmers.

The president of a Henderson farm supply business wrote Director Mann in 1958:

"If the weather was unfavorable or disease took its toll then the farmer was in bad shape through no fault of his own and many times we had to carry over balances for several years before he could pay out.

"Federal crop insurance has changed that situation a lot. The farmer can now make his arrangements much easier and the bankers and the credit merchants can feel assured that they will get their money if they do not extend credit above the amount of the crop insurance. We also might mention that this insurance creates a much better feeling between the farmer and the people he owes and he can go about his business of farming with confidence."

NECESSARY FOR LOAN

Today, says Mann, banks and other private credit organizations, and some public agencies like production credit associations, "almost make it a requirement that a farmer have all-risk Federal crop insurance before he can obtain a loan."

He also observes that over 90 percent of the people in eastern North Carolina "are borrowing or lending, or both—in other words, credit is involved."

Most indemnity payments are relatively small. In 1962, however, one man in Beaufort County received over \$50,000 for tobacco losses. Many claims checks have been written in the \$10,000 range.

Julian Edward Mann was born February 26, 1905, "in the middle of the State penitentiary" in Raleigh. That was while his father, Julian S. Mann, was head of the State prison system under Governor William B. Aycock. The elder Julian, a classmate of Josephus Daniels at Chapel Hill, served as prison director for 12 years. Earlier he had represented Hyde County in the State house of representatives. He died in 1946.

Director Mann's mother, who died in 1947, was Emma Bonner Mann, also from Hyde

County. Julian Edward was next to the youngest among three daughters and two sons. Misses Edith and Edna Mann, twins, live in Raleigh. So does brother Edward Bonner Mann, who is in the fertilizer business here. The third sister, Mrs. Harvey B. Mann, lives in Hyde County.

RALEIGH BOYHOOD

Young Julian spent part of his boyhood in Raleigh and part on the family's general farm in Hyde. He attended the old Wiley School in Raleigh through the sixth grade, went to Lake Landing High School in Hyde for 2 years, and then entered Augusta Military Academy in Virginia, where he graduated in 1922.

Hyde was so isolated in those days that the military academy allotted Mann just as much travel time for Christmas holidays as students from California received. He made the trip partly by train, partly by boat.

Mann attended the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he received a B.S. degree in commerce (now business administration) in 1926. He majored in risk and risk-bearing—the fundamentals of insurance.

When he went to Chapel Hill, his father told him: "When you stop taking Latin I will stop sending checks." So Julian took all the Latin he could get. At UNC, he was a member of KA and AKP fraternities.

Mann worked with Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Co., at Greensboro for about a year and then returned to Hyde to teach at Engelhard High School. Later he attended North Carolina State in Raleigh and earned a master's degree in agricultural economics, working under Dr. Joseph Knapp, who helped organize the Farmers Cooperative Exchange. Mann wrote his thesis on the North Carolina Cotton Growers Cooperative Association.

MARRIED IN 1934

During the depression years he worked with the North Carolina Tax Commission. About this time he met Carrie Mae Griffin, of Concord, who had attended Woman's College at Greensboro and was working in Raleigh. They were married November 24, 1934.

The Manns have three children: Mrs. Robert B. McBurney, Jr., Temple, Tex.; Katherine, 19, who will be a junior at Chapel Hill this fall; and Julian III, known as Jule, an officer in the rising senior class at Broughton High School. Katherine is making her debut here next month.

In 1934 Mann joined the staff of the old Bureau of Agricultural Economics to assist with the agricultural adjustment administration programs organized by Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace. A year later he went with the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service as extension economist and aid to John W. Goodman, assistant director. His major assignment was to compile and disseminate statistical information about North Carolina agriculture.

Mann was with the extension service for 10 years, until he was appointed to his present post. Earlier this year he received a 30-year service pin from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

His hobbies are feeding and watching birds, amateur photography, and studying North Carolina biography. A member of both grange and farm bureau, he is on the State council of the American Society of Public Administration and is secretary of the State administrative council, composed of the heads of all USDA agencies in North Carolina.

The family lives at 2608 Clark Avenue in Raleigh.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding this time to me.

There is one question which I want to ask a result of listening to the gentleman from Texas, and that is this: Have any of the private insurance companies gone into this kind of insurance?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. No private company in recent years has undertaken to write this crop insurance as far as we have been able to ascertain such as is written by the Federal Crop Insurance Company.

Long years ago some companies tried it, but very unsuccessfully.

The gentleman knows that this program was expensive in the early days. However, now it is operating on a profit-making basis. No private company complains about it.

Mr. CURTIS. I am thinking also along this line: If it has reached the point where it is profitable then, indeed, we might be thinking of moving the Government out, and I hope we would.

I was very interested in the discussion and I certainly want to find out what its status is now.

Obviously, this represents an area where the Government can eventually get out, and I would hope so. However, I am not opposing the bill in any way.

Mr. COOLEY. We are making progress. It is something that might be taken up, but at the moment I do not think private companies will take it over.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I want to direct a question. Would this cover tidal wave problems?

Mr. POAGE. It covers all losses, according to my understanding. There are different policies written in this program. A comprehensive loss insurance policy would cover tidal waves, volcanoes or anything else that might affect crops. It insures the production of crops against all hazards except those where the insured himself could have prevented the loss.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I am strongly in favor of extending this Federal crop insurance program. Three of the original counties in the then pilot programs were in the district I am privileged to represent in southwest Missouri. It has given many of those who were insured a return up to 91 cents for each dollar that has been paid in premiums for the various crop loans. The Federal Crop Insurance Act, as specified, carried the hope of Congress that the premiums paid by the insured would equal the indemnities over a long period of time. I join my colleagues in the hope of its eventually being returned to free and private enterprise of America when they

can and will carry it. It has resulted in some heavy payments in losses in the years from all causes, when farmer crops failed to produce or were destroyed by natural or other disaster.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The SPEAKER. In connection with the passage of H.R. 4497, without objection, the title will be amended.

There was no objection.

REPORT OF CHANGES IN CONTROL OF FEDERALLY INSURED BANKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12267) to provide for notice of change in control of management of insured banks, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811-1831), as amended, be amended by adding the following new subsection (j) at the end of section 7 thereof:

"(j) (1) Whenever a change occurs in the outstanding voting stock of any insured bank which will result in control or in a change in the control of the bank, the president or other chief executive officer of such bank shall promptly report such facts to the appropriate Federal banking agency upon obtaining knowledge of such change. As used in this subsection, the term 'control' means the power to directly or indirectly direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of the bank. A change in ownership of voting stock which would result in direct or indirect ownership by a stockholder or an affiliated group of stockholders of less than 10 percent of the outstanding voting stock shall not be considered a change of control. If there is any doubt as to whether a change in the outstanding voting stock is sufficient to result in control thereof or to effect a change in the control thereof, such doubt shall be resolved in favor of reporting the facts to the appropriate Federal banking agency.

"(2) Whenever an insured bank makes a loan or loans, secured, or to be secured, by 25 per centum or more of the outstanding voting stock of an insured bank, the president or other chief executive officer of the lending bank shall promptly report such fact to the appropriate Federal banking agency of the bank whose stock secures the loan or loans upon obtaining knowledge of such loan or loans, except that no report need be made in those cases where the borrower has been the owner of record of the stock for a period of one year or more, or the stock is that of a newly organized bank prior to its opening.

"(3) The reports required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall contain the following information to the extent that it is known by the person making the report: (a) the number of shares involved, (b) the names of the sellers (or transferors), (c) the names of the purchasers (or transferees), (d) the names of the beneficial owners if the shares are registered in another name, (e) the purchase price, (f) the total number of shares owned by the sellers (or transferors), the purchasers (or transferees) and the beneficial owners both immediately before and after the transaction, and in the case of a loan, (g) the name of the borrower, (h) the amount of the loan, and (i) the

name of the bank issuing the stock securing the loan and the number of shares securing the loan. In addition to the foregoing, such reports shall contain such other information as may be available to inform the appropriate Federal banking agency of the effect of the transaction upon control of the bank whose stock is involved.

"(4) Whenever such a change as described in paragraph (1) of this subsection occurs, each insured bank shall report promptly to the appropriate Federal banking agency any changes or replacement of its chief executive officer or of any director occurring in the next twelve-month period, including in its report a statement of the past and current business and professional affiliations of the new chief executive officer or directors.

"(5) The Comptroller of the Currency shall immediately furnish to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation a copy of any such report required in this subsection and received by him, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall immediately furnish to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation a copy of any such report required in this subsection and received by it.

"(6) As used in this section, the term 'appropriate Federal banking agency' shall mean (a) the Comptroller of the Currency in the case of a national banking association or a district bank, (b) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in the case of a State member insured bank (except a district bank), and (c) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the case of a State nonmember insured bank (except a district bank)."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

H.R. 12267 would provide for notice to the appropriate Federal agency of changes in control of insured banks. Specifically it would amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require the chief executive of banking institutions to report changes in control. It would also require banks to report loans secured by 25 percent or more of the stock of any insured bank. In addition, changes of the chief executive officers or directors occurring after changes in control would have to be reported.

Under the bill national banks would report to the Comptroller of the Currency, and State banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System would report to the Federal Reserve Board. The third category of banks, insured State banks that are not members of the Federal Reserve System, would report to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The fact is that a very thorough investigation is made in the case of newly chartered banks that apply for deposit insurance. However, after a bank has obtained its insurance there is no statutory provision relating to changes in control and management.

There have been several recent bank failures where it was discovered that new

groups have seized control of insured banks and then proceeded to exchange substandard or even fraudulent assets for cash in the banks. The resulting impairment in the capital structure of the banks caused them to become insolvent and this in turn required payment of insured deposits by the FDIC. Since March of this year there have been five insured bank failures. All of them were preceded by a recent change in control or management and a rather sudden deterioration in the character of the banks' assets.

By requiring notice to the Federal banking authorities the bill will make it possible for them to promptly investigate changes in control and determine the effect on the bank and the need for any corrective action. Without this kind of notice in change of management, harm may be done during the periods between regular examinations. Thus the bill will provide Federal banking agencies with a useful aid in meeting their obligations and responsibilities to individual depositors as well as the American commercial banking system.

The bill was proposed by the FDIC and endorsed by the administration.

The Independent Bankers Association advises that these measures will enhance the effectiveness of the supervisory agencies. They express concern with the "isolated but significant instances of looting that follow changes in control of banks this year," and they went on to say that these instances point up a weakness that should be corrected by this bill. Likewise the American Bankers Association favors enactment of the bill. It was approved by the Banking and Currency Committee without a dissenting vote.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our committee has described this bill very well. The main thing we have to keep in mind is the safety of the depositors' money in the banks. This bill was suggested by the Director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, a former colleague, Mr. Wolcott, when he found that changes in the financial condition of banks brought about by changes in management make the reporting of such changes necessary. The reports of the changes in management of the banks are not difficult to make nor voluminous.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, and know of no opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if this bill will stop the fast operators in the banking business, a condition that apparently needs some changes, I am for it.

I wonder if this will have anything to do with the bank in Texas that failed not so long ago and left as one of its assets a bawdy house. From what I hear lately, the publicity that accrued to this bank failure and the acquisition by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation of that particular brothel slowed down business to the extent it is not now con-

sidered one of the better assets of that particular bank.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. I personally do not know about the assets of the Marlin Bank. The gentleman may be mistaken.

Mr. GROSS. This is the Marlin Bank—not the Dell City Bank.

Mr. PATMAN. It is the Marlin Bank, of Marlin, Tex. I understood they had an asset or a mortgage on a place in Houston. But I do not know—the gentleman referred to business decreasing—does he refer to the bank or to the other place?

Mr. GROSS. Well, I assume it would have its effect both ways. But it was the other place, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know anything about that. I do not know about the other place or the bank either. I just know the bank has been satisfactorily liquidated and all of the depositors have been paid.

Mr. GROSS. I supposed, from what I heard coming out of the Democratic Convention, that everything is lovely and the goose is hanging high in Texas, and I just wondered if this bill would have any effect on that situation.

Mr. PATMAN. This is not a political proposal. Of course, politically we feel that we are doing all right.

Mr. GROSS. I was just curious.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to proceed out of the regular order.)

STATESMANSHIP IN PHILADELPHIA

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, during this past weekend in the city of Philadelphia our courageous mayor, the Honorable James H. J. Tate, and his various departments were confronted with a very serious riot situation.

Through Mayor Tate's wise leadership and with the efficient help extended him by Police Commissioner Howard R. Leary, the condition was brought under control within 24 hours.

The members of the Philadelphia congressional delegation are justly proud of Mayor Tate and those who assisted him. We respectfully call the following commendation to the attention of the membership of the House:

Unfortunately, during the past weekend, Philadelphia has experienced 24 hours of the type of vandalism and hoodlumism which has visited so many cities throughout the country in the past 6 months.

We join in our highest compliments to Mayor Tate, the Philadelphia Police Department, and the Fairmount Park guards for the effective way in which this condition was localized and brought under control within 24 hours.

The firm and positive police action in breaking up and apprehending roving gangs and imported hoodlums without the loss of human life—without the use of methods

which have brought national and international criticism to other areas—calls for the appreciation and commendation of all of our citizens.

We, the members of the Philadelphia delegation to the Congress, join in saluting Mayor Tate, Police Commissioner Leary, and all of the city departments involved and assure them of our full support.

WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
ROBERT N. C. NIX,
JAMES A. BYRNE,
HERMAN TOLL,
WILLIAM J. GREEN,
Members of Congress.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to give my support to H.R. 12267, which requires the reporting to the appropriate Federal banking supervisory agencies of changes in the control of management of banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Last October the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations held hearings into the marked rises in crimes against banking institutions. The subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has the obligation of evaluating the efficiency and economy with which the operations of certain departments and agencies of the Government are conducted—among them the Federal agencies which supervise and examine the banks and savings and loan institutions within their jurisdictions. In the performance of that responsibility, and against the rise in bank crimes, the subcommittee sought to learn whether there was anything the Federal supervisory agencies could do to deal more effectively with the problem.

The report which resulted from the subcommittee's hearings, House Report No. 1147, 88th Congress, 2d session, discussed the advisability of the supervisory agencies having power to compel changes in bank ownership and management to be reported to the agencies. Our report noted that the Federal supervisory agencies were agreed that the general character of the management of a proposed bank is very important to its success and should receive the careful attention of the supervisory agencies which pass upon applications for bank charters and insurance of deposits; and that the general character of management continues its vital role in the operation of a bank throughout its existence, for it is management which installs and maintains the internal routines and controls, and the physical security systems of the bank.

We further noted that it seemed appropriate to the FDIC that supervisory agencies should have the proper authority to approve or disapprove major changes in bank management, and that legislative action in the area would strengthen the means of preventing and disclosing bank crimes, and afford a worthwhile deterrent to those persons who might otherwise be tempted to commit crimes against banks. We also pointed out that there had been indications in the public press that mobsters and racketeers increasingly had been investing in legitimate businesses, including the banking business.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate considered social security bill, agreeing to vote at 2 p.m. Wednesday on medicare amendment.

House passed 12 sundry bills.

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 20560-20572

Bills Introduced: 4 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3164-3167; and S.J. Res. 198.

Page 20561

Bill Reported: Report was made as follows: H.R. 12342, authorizing certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept decorations and other things given them by certain foreign countries, with amendment (S. Rept. 1520).

Page 20560

Mineral Leasing: S. 1984, relating to the date of payment of rentals on mineral lease renewals, was passed with committee amendment.

Pages 20604-20609

Outdoor Recreation: Senate adopted conference report on H.R. 3846, to establish a Land and Water Conservation Fund to assist in improvement of outdoor recreation facilities, receding from Senate amendments Nos. 1-4, 8, and 9. These actions cleared bill for President's signature.

Pages 20584-20585

Social Security: Senate continued its consideration of H.R. 11865, proposed Social Security Amendments of 1964, entering the following unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate: On Wednesday, September 2, at 2 p.m., Senate will vote on Gore amendment (to Long of Louisiana amendment), time between convening and 2 p.m. to be divided equally between majority and minority leaders. The Gore amendment would substitute provisions on health and hospital care for the aged for language in Long amendment concerning maximum amount that may be earned before deductions from benefits.

Pages 20585-20604, 20612-20619

Nominations: Four civilian, one judicial, and numerous Navy nominations were received.

Pages 20627-20628

Quorum Calls: Two quorum calls were taken today.

Pages 20573, 20596

Program for Wednesday: Senate met at 10 a.m. and recessed at 5:56 p.m. until noon Wednesday, September 2, when it will continue consideration of H.R. 11865, social security, with vote to be taken at 2 p.m. on Gore medicare amendment.

Pages 20619, 20627

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

U.N. DUES, AND COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee met in executive session to hear Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, testify with regard to United Nations financing problems.

Committee ordered favorably reported with amendments H.R. 12259, regarding determination of claims of U.S. nationals against the Government of Cuba. Committee also approved routine Foreign Service nominations.

INDIANS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Indian Affairs held hearings on the following bills:

H.R. 10204 (S. 2581), to extend the Osage Tribe mineral estate reservation for an indefinite period, with testimony from Senators Monroney and Edmondson, the latter of whom submitted a statement; Representative Edmondson; Graham E. Holmes, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; and Paul Pitts and W. O. Cooper, both of the Osage Tribal Council, who were accompanied by their counsel, Arthur Lazarus;

S. 3035, to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Band

of Chippewa Indians, with testimony from Graham E. Holmes;

S. 3079, to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, with testimony from Graham E. Holmes; and Glenn A. Wilkinson, Quinaielt tribal attorney; and

S. 3114, to assess certain lands within the Lummi Indian diking project, Washington, through formation of a drainage and diking district, with testimony from Graham E. Holmes.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee held hearings on the nominations of Charles A. Muecke, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Arizona, with testimony from Senator Hayden and Representative Udall; and on the nomination of Francis C. Whelan, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of California, with testimony from Senator Salinger. The nominees were present to testify and answer questions on their own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 9 public bills, H.R. 12505-12513; 27 private bills, H.R. 12514-12540; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 361, and H. Res. 872 and 873, were introduced.

Page 20559

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows.

Disposition of executive papers (H. Rept. 1848); and Twenty-eight private bills, S. 584, 1737, 1966, 1986, 1999, 2163, 2205, 2599, 2629, 2673, 2812, 1640, 2063, S. Con. Res. 66, H.R. 2306, 4758, 5853, 5978, 6008, 8967, 9029, 9674, 10198, 10242, 10725, 10879, H.J. Res. 1157, and H.R. 6184 (H. Repts. 1849-1876, respectively).

Pages 20558-20559

Labor-HEW Appropriations: Disagreed to Senate amendments to H.R. 10809, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for fiscal year 1965; agreed to a conference requested by the Senate; and appointed Representatives Fogarty, Denton, Mahon, Laird, and Michel conferees on the part of the House.

Pages 20511-20512

Canyonlands National Park: Insisted on House amendments to S. 27, to establish the Canyonlands National Park in Utah; agreed to a conference requested by the Senate; and appointed as conferees Representatives Aspinall, Morris, Taylor, Saylor, and Burton of Utah.

Page 20512

Private Calendar: Agreed to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar.

Page 20512

Recreation Improvement Program: Adopted the conference report on H.R. 3846, to establish a Land and Water Conservation Fund to assist in improvement of outdoor recreation facilities, and sent the legislation to the Senate.

Pages 20512-29514

Suspension Passages: The following bills were called up, considered, and passed under suspension of the rules:

Isthmus Canal: S. 2701, to provide for a study to determine a site for construction of a sea-level canal be-

tween the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans (amended and returned to Senate—passed by a record vote of 320 yeas to 23 nays).

Pages 20514-20522

VA hospital names: H.R. 11461, to provide for the designation of certain Veterans' Administration facilities (passed by a voice vote and sent to the Senate).

Pages 20522-20525

Pesticides: H.R. 4487, to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides and pesticides (amended and passed by a record vote of 236 yeas to 110 nays).

Pages 20525-20530

Crop insurance: S. 277, to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year (cleared for the President by a voice vote).

Pages 20530-20533

Banking: H.R. 12267, to provide for notice of change in control of management of insured banks (amended and passed by a voice vote).

Pages 20533-20535

Alaska Centennial Commission: S. 49, to provide for recognition by the United States of Alaska's 100th anniversary under the American flag (amended and returned to the Senate).

Pages 20535-20536

Merchant marine: S. 2995, to amend the Merchant Marine Act in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds (cleared for President by a voice vote).

Page 20536

Crooked River reclamation project: S. 1186, to provide for irrigation of additional lands within the Crooked River Federal reclamation project (amended to contain the text of H.R. 1712 and returned to the Senate).

Pages 20536-20538

Chief Joseph Dam: S. 2447, authorizing construction of the Whitestone Coulee unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington (amended to contain the text of H.R. 5118 and returned to the Senate).

Pages 20538-20541

Fish: H.R. 2392, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, develop-



Public Law 88-589
88th Congress, S. 277
September 12, 1964

An Act

78 STAT. 933.

To amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth sentence of section 508(a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)), is amended by striking out "in not to exceed 100 counties", and inserting in lieu thereof "in not to exceed 150 counties".

Crop insurance.

67 Stat. 575.

Approved September 12, 1964.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 1740 (Comm. on Agriculture).
SENATE REPORT No. 450 (Comm. on Agriculture & Forestry).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Vol. 109 (1963): Aug. 28, considered and passed Senate.
Vol. 110 (1964): Sept. 1, considered and passed House.

